



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

LIBRARY
UNIVE
CALIFORNIA
SANTA CRUZ



[





1930

HISTORY OF THE NORMAN CONQUEST.

London
MACMILLAN AND CO.



PUBLISHERS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF
Oxford

THE HISTORY
OF THE
NORMAN CONQUEST OF ENGLAND,

ITS CAUSES AND ITS RESULTS.

BY
EDWARD A. FREEMAN, M.A.

LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE.

VOLUME I.

THE PRELIMINARY HISTORY TO THE ELECTION OF EDWARD THE CONFESSOR.

Αἰσέσμεν δὴ ἄνδρας ἐνδόξους, καὶ τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν τῇ γενέσει . . . κυριεύσαντες
ἐν ταῖς βασιλείαις αὐτῶν . . . βουλευσονται ἐν συνέσει αὐτῶν . . . ἡγούμενοι λαοῦ
ἐν διαβουλίῳ.—*Exodus. c. xlii.*

Oxford:
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS.
M.DCCC.LXVII.

Library



Library

Library



The

The



DA
195
F855
v. 1

PREFACE.

THE present volume is the first instalment of a work which I have contemplated, and for which I have at various times collected materials, for the last twenty years. I had hoped to complete the work, or so much of it as would come down to the actual accession of William the Conqueror, in time for it to appear during the year 1866, the octocentenary year of the Conquest. I found however that, to make the main subject really intelligible from my point of view, it was necessary to treat the preliminary history at much greater length than I had originally thought of. The present volume therefore is merely introductory to the account of the actual Conquest. The second portion of the narrative, containing the reigns of Eadward, Harold, and William, is already in progress, and will follow with all possible speed.

I think it right to add that this work must not be taken as a sign that I have at all given up the design of going on with my History of Federal Government. Of the second volume of that work a

considerable part is already written. One or two circumstances led me to lay it aside for a time, and I do not at all regret that such has been the case. The part on which I was engaged was the history of the German Confederation, and I find that, of what I have written, part has already become antiquated through the events of the past year. When Germany shall have assumed a shape possessing some greater chance of permanence than her present clearly transitional state, I shall be better able to take a general view of German Federal history from the beginning. The peculiarity of the German Confederation is that it is the one recorded Confederation which arose from the separation of the component parts of a Kingdom. There now seems every chance of its changing back again into something more like its original state. The condition of the Hanseatic towns also, another part of my subject, is already greatly modified by the same events. It is even possible that they may not be without effect on the European position of Switzerland. On the whole, I believe that the delay in my work will only lead to its improvement, and that a volume on Swiss Federalism, and on German Federalism generally, will be far more valuable two or three years hence than it would have been if I had been able to complete it in the year before last.

With regard to my present work, my main object is to draw out that view of the Norman Conquest which I believe to be the one true one. That view, I may say, is formed by uniting the views of the

two most eminent writers who have dealt with the subject, Augustine Thierry and Sir Francis Palgrave. The name of the last-mentioned illustrious scholar can never be uttered by any student of early English history without a feeling of deep gratitude. But his great and unfinished works set forth only half the truth. His eloquent French rival sets forth the other half. Each of these great writers must stand charged with considerable exaggeration on his own side of the question. Still, in the main, I think we may say that each is right in what he asserts and wrong only in what he leaves out of sight. From one point of view, the Norman Conquest was nearly all that Thierry says that it was ; from another point of view, it was hardly more than Sir Francis Palgrave says that it was. Both writers also singularly resemble each other in a certain lack of critical power. Nothing in any period of history, above all, nothing in the period of history with which I am concerned, is more necessary than to distinguish the respective value of different authorities. Now in this respect both Thierry and Sir Francis Palgrave were deficient. Neither, I believe, ever made a statement for which he could not give chapter and verse in some shape or other. But both of them were too apt to catch at any statement which seemed at all to support their several theories, without always stopping to reflect whether such statements came from contemporary chronicles or charters or from careless and ill-informed compilers three or four centuries later.

The prominence which I have given to the preliminary history contained in this volume is due to a deep and growing conviction that the history of the Norman Conquest, and indeed all later English history also, is constantly misunderstood through a fatal habit of beginning the study of English history with the Norman Conquest itself. A confused and unhappy nomenclature hinders many people from realizing that Englishmen before 1066 were the same people as Englishmen after 1066. They thus fail to perceive that the Norman Conquest, instead of wiping out the race, the laws, or the language which existed before it, did but communicate to us a certain foreign infusion in all three branches, which was speedily absorbed and assimilated into the preexisting mass. We cannot understand the Norman Conquest of England without knowing something of the history both of Englishmen and of Normans before they met in arms on the hills of Sussex. As regards the Normans, the conquest of England was but the most brilliant and the most permanent of a series of brilliant conquests, from the occupation of Rouen to the occupation of Naples. As regards England, the Conquest was the grand and final result of causes which had been at work at least ever since the death of Eadgar. The Danish invasions, and the Norman tendencies of Eadward, each, in different ways, both suggested the enterprise of William and made that enterprise easier to be effected. I therefore look on the earlier history of Normandy, and still more on the English history from the accession

of Æthelred to the death of Harthacnut, as so closely connected with my subject as to need a treatment in considerable detail. With the reign of Eadward the period of the Conquest itself begins. And I may add that I have done my best to throw some life into a period of our history which is full alike of political instruction and of living personal interest. That period is commonly presented to ordinary readers in the guise either of fantastic legends or else of summaries of the most repulsive dryness. I have striven to show what was the real political state of England in the tenth and eleventh centuries. I have striven also to clothe with flesh and blood the dry bones of men like Brihtnoth and Ulfcytel and Eadmund and our illustrious Danish conqueror himself.

As in my History of Federal Government I ventured to restore the Greek spelling of proper names, so I now follow the example of scholars like Kemble, Lappenberg, and others, in employing the genuine spelling of Old-English names. As they are generally spelled, they are a mere chaos of French and Latin corruptions, following no principle of any kind. *Æselstán* becomes "*Athelstane*," while *Æselred*, exactly the same form, becomes "*Ethelred*." I do not however follow Mr. Kemble in retaining the obsolete letter *ȝ*. It seems to me as much out of place to write *Æselȝryȝ* in the midst of a modern English sentence, as it would be to write *Aθéné* or *Θεοpompos*. At one time I felt inclined to except those names which are still in familiar use,

like *Alfred* and *Edward*, on the same principle on which I write *Philip* and not *Philippos*. Were the English names, like the Greek, simply cut short at the end, there would be no difficulty in so doing. But it would be unpleasantly inconsistent to write *Ælfric* and *Alfred*, *Eadwig* and *Edward*. I therefore make a chronological distinction ; by the time of our post-Norman Edwards, the *a* had been dropped in contemporary spelling, and I write accordingly. The names of Normans and other foreigners, William, John, and the like, I give in their modern shape. Nothing could be gained by writing *Willelm*, *Willaume*, or *Guillaume*, all of them mere corruptions just as much as the modern English form. Names of places again I write with their usual modern spelling, because in them we have, what in the names of men we have not, an universally received and, allowing for some misconceptions, fairly consistent system. I except only one or two places, like Brunanburh, Ethandun, Assandun, of which the geographical position is more or less uncertain, and whose fame is wholly confined to the time of which I am writing.

I have given two maps, chiefly founded on those in Spruner's Hand-Atlas. As in the maps which accompanied my History of Federal Government, any attempts to mark the boundaries of states whose boundaries were always fluctuating must always be more or less conjectural, and my conjectures, or those of Dr. Spruner, may not be the same as the conjectures of all my readers. All such attempts

must be taken at what they are worth and no more. For one such conjecture I am specially responsible. In the map of Britain in 597 I have attempted, by means of cross-colouring, to mark the extent of territory north of the Thames and Avon, which was West-Saxon in 597, but which I believe to have become Mercian in 628. In so doing I have followed the indications given by Dr. Guest in his papers and local maps; but I believe that mine is the first attempt to show the results of his researches on the general map of Britain. In this map my object was to mark all ascertained places mentioned in the Chronicles, with the addition of a few from Bæda, up to the time of Ecgberht. In the later map of the English Empire my principle was to mark those places which were mentioned in my own history from the time of Ecgberht to the Norman Conquest.

I have now only to return my thanks to those friends who have helped me in my undertaking in various ways, by comments and suggestions, by the loan of books, and in a few cases, though very few, by verifying references to books which I had not at hand. At their head I am proud to place the two men who stand at the head of living students of English history, Dr. Guest and Professor Stubbs. I have also to thank Viscount Strangford for several valuable suggestions as to the early Celtic ethnology of Britain. My thanks are due also for help of different kinds to the Rev. S. W. Wayte, now President of Trinity College, to the Rev. John Earle, late Professor of Anglo-Saxon, to the Rev. J. E. B.

Mayor, of St. John's College, Cambridge, to F. H. Dickinson, Esq., of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Rev. J. R. Green, of Jesus College, a rising scholar to whom I look for the continuation of my own work, and to W. B. Dawkins, Esq., of Jesus College and of the Geological Survey. Mr. Dawkins I have especially to thank for much help in my investigations of the battle-fields of Maldon and Assandun, and I look to him for more valuable help still when I come to the greater battle which forms the centre of my whole history. And I must add my thanks for the kindness of every sort which I have uniformly received from the Delegates of the University Press, from one especially whose loss all historical students are now lamenting, my late learned and deeply esteemed friend Dr. Shirley.

SOMERLEAZE, WELLS,

January 4th, 1867.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

A. D.		PAGE
	The Norman Conquest important, not as the beginning of English history, but as its chief turning-point .	1
	Necessity of the earlier English History to its right understanding	2
	Its character as compared with earlier and later conquests	3
	Nature of the changes effected by it	3—5
	Divisions of the work	5—7

CHAPTER II.

FORMATION OF THE KINGDOM OF ENGLAND. 449—975.

§ 1. *The Heathen Period of English Conquest.* 449—597.

The languages, races, and local names of Britain essentially the same now as at the time of the Norman Conquest	8
The Norman element absorbed in the existing English nation	9
The English Conquest: credibility of the narrative .	9
Question of earlier Teutonic settlements	10—12
Analogy of the Danish invasions	12
Course of the English Conquest to the end of the sixth century	13—15
Difference between the English Conquest and other Teutonic conquests	15—18
Extirmination of the Celtic inhabitants	18
Causes and results of the difference	19—21
Britain at the end of the sixth century; occupation of the country by various Low Dutch tribes	21

A. D.		PAGE
	No regular Heptarchy, but seven Kingdoms prominent among others	22—23
	Growth of Wessex	23
	Peculiar character of Mercia	25
	Supremacy of the Bretwaldas	27
	§ 2. <i>Conversion of the English to Christianity.</i> 597—681.	
	Peaceful progress of Christianity in England	29
	Effects of the conversion ; increased intercourse with the continent	30—31
	England the first national church in the West	32
	Cessation of wars of extermination	33
	Advance of Wessex ; Celtic element in the Western counties	33—35
	§ 3. <i>Fluctuations of Dominion between Northumberland, Mercia, and Wessex.</i> 577—823.	
617—633	Rivalry of Mercia and Northumberland ; reign of Eadwine	36
627—655	Reign of Penda of Mercia	36—37
635—685	Greatness of Northumberland under Oswald and his successors	37—38
716—819	Renewed greatness of Mercia ; reign of Offa	38—39
	Influence of Charles the Great in English affairs	39
800	Accession of Ecgberht of Wessex	40
	§ 4. <i>Permanent supremacy of Wessex.</i> 823—924.	
800—827	Gradual submission of the other English Kingdoms to Ecgberht	40—42
813—835	His successes over the Welsh ; independence of the Northern Celts	42—43
787—1070	Danish Invasions	44
	Three Periods of the Danish Invasions	44—46
836—901	Reigns of Æthelwulf and his sons	46
867—877	Danish Conquest of Northumberland, East-Anglia, and part of Mercia	47
871—880	Election of Ælfred ; Danish Invasions of Wessex	47—48
878—890	Peace of Wedmore and establishment of Guthrum in East-Anglia	48
	Character and extent of the Danish occupation ; its effect on local nomenclature	48—51
	Character of Ælfred	51—55
	Consolidation of England promoted by the Danish Wars	55—57
893—901	Later wars and death of Ælfred	57—58

CONTENTS.

xv

A. D.		PAGE
901—925	Reign of Eadward the Elder; his Kingdom reaches the Humber	58—59
924	Commendation of Northumberland, Scotland, and Strathclyde	60—61
§ 5. <i>Imperial Supremacy of the West-Saxon Kings of the English.</i> 924—975.		
925—940	Reign of Æthelstan; Northumberland first incorporated	62—63
937	Battle of Brunanburh	62
940—955	Reigns of Eadmund and Eadred; final incorporation of Northumberland	63—64
945	Grant of Cumberland to Malcolm of Scotland	64
955	Reign of Eadwig in Wessex and Eadgar in Mercia	65
	Character of Dunstan	65—66
958—975	Sole reign of Eadgar; his supremacy over all Britain	66—68
975—1016	Reigns of Eadward and Æthelred	68
	Recapitulation	70

CHAPTER III.

THE CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND IN THE TENTH AND ELEVENTH CENTURIES.

The Old-English Constitution survived the Norman Conquest	71—73
---	-------

§ 1. *Origin of the Old-English Kingship.*

Recapitulation of the growth of Wessex	73—74
The germs of our institutions to be traced to the earliest times	74—75
Analogy with other Teutonic and other Aryan nations	76
Origin of Kingship; earlier government by Ealdormen or Heretogan	76—79
Difference between Ealdormen and Kings	80—81
Title of King	81—82
Kingship national and not territorial	82—84
Growth of kingly power through extension of territory	84—85

§ 2. *The Early Teutonic Constitution and its Decay.*

The Teutonic Free Community; analogies elsewhere	86
<i>Eorls</i> and <i>Ceorls</i>	87—89
The <i>Mark</i> ; <i>Folkland</i> ; the <i>Eðel</i>	89—90
Origin and nature of the <i>Comitatus</i> or <i>Thegnhood</i> ; Homeric and other analogies	91—94
The <i>Thegns</i> supplant the old <i>Eorls</i>	94—95

A. D.		PAGE
	Effects of the change ; Commendation ; depression of the Ceorls	95—97
	Growth of feudal principles	97—99
	Earlier form of military service	99—100
	<i>Folkland</i> and <i>Bookland</i>	100—102
	Comparison between England, Germany, and Switzerland	103
	Changes in the ancient Constitution ; their necessity	104
	Ceorldom sinks into Villainage, but the Villains are gradually emancipated	104
	Amalgamation of Marks into Shires and of Shires into Kingdoms	104—106
	§ 3. <i>Origin and Powers of the Witenagemót.</i>	
	Democratic constitution of the old Assemblies of the Mark and the Shire	106—108
	The Assembly of the Kingdom inevitably shrinks up into an Assembly of the King's Thegns	108—111
	The <i>Witenagemót</i> of Wessex becomes the General Legislature, the <i>Gemóts</i> of other Kingdoms surviving as local bodies	111
	Powers of the <i>Gemót</i> greater than those of a modern Parliament	113
	Right of deposing the King	113—115
	Right of electing the King ; combination of the hereditary and elective principles	115—119
	Direct action of the Witan in all matters	119—121
	Joint action of the King and the Witan	122
	Loss and recovery of parliamentary freedom after the Conquest	122—123
	Importance of the personal character of the King	123—125
	His influence as Executive and as <i>Hlaford</i> of the chief men	125—126
	§ 4. <i>The Imperial Power of the King and his Relation to the Dependent Kingdoms.</i>	
954	England one Kingdom, but much local independence retained	126—127
	Superiority of the West-Saxon Kings over all Britain	127
	Statement of the question as to their supremacy	128
924	Superiority over Scotland dates from the Commendation to Eadward	128
922	Final Commendation of the Welsh	128—129
	Nature of Commendation ; analogous instances	129—132
924—1291	Claims of the two Edwards ; change of ideas meanwhile	132

CONTENTS.

xvii

A. D.		PAGE
	Threefold relation of the King of Scots to the English Crown	133
	Geography and relations of Scotland, Lothian, and Strathclyde	133—134
	History of Cumberland	135—138
	History of Lothian; it becomes the historical Scotland	138—141
	Analogy between Scotland and Switzerland	141—142
922—1283	History of Wales	142
	Position of the dependent Kingdoms	143—145
	Statement of the case as to the Imperial Titles	145—146
	The Titles used in the Charters imply an Imperial position	147—150
	No continuous tradition from the Provincial Emperors	151—152
286—407	Real position of the "Tyrants"	152—154
	No analogy between them and the Bretwaldas	154—156
	The Imperial style adopted through a feeling that the position of the West-Saxon Kings was analogous to that of the Emperors	156—159
	Position of Ecgberht, of Æthelstan, of Eadgar	156—158
	The Imperial titles go out of use after the Norman Conquest	159—160
	Late instances of their use	160—161
827—1866	Growth of the English system of dependencies	162
	The Kingdom of England and Empire of Britain transferred to William	163

CHAPTER IV.

SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF NORMANDY DURING THE TENTH CENTURY.

	Original kindred of Englishmen, Danes, and Normans	166
	Danes in England become Englishmen, in Gaul, Frenchmen	167
	§ 1. <i>General Effects of the Scandinavian Settlements in Gaul.</i>	
	Analogy between the settlements of Holf and Guthrum	168
	Results of the Norman settlement on general history; character of the Normans	169—171
	Effects on French history; position of Gaul; struggle between Paris and Laon decided by the Normans	172
	Origin of Modern France; distinction between it and ancient "Francia"	173—175
888	Division of the Empire; Eastern and Western Franks	176
830—888	Growing importance of Paris; Odo the first Parisian King	176—177

A. D.		PAGE
888—987	Struggle between the Karlings and the descendants of Robert	178—179
987—1792	The Parisian dynasty permanent after Hugh Capet	180
	End of the connexion between France and Germany ; settlement of Lotharingia	180—181
	§ 2. <i>Settlement and Reign of Rolf.</i> 911—927.	
	The Danish ravages within the Empire compared with those in England	182—185
	Various Danish settlements in Gaul ; exceptional importance of that at Rouen	185—187
876—911 ?	Character of Rolf ; his earlier exploits	187—188
911	Rolf in possession of Rouen ; his defeat at Chartres	188—189
912	Peace of Clair-on-Epte ; analogy with that of Wedmore	189
	The Kingdom strengthened by the cession	189—190
	Rolf's homage to Charles ; extent of his grant	190—194
	Internal condition of Normandy ; probable position of the two races ; vestiges of the Danish language	194—195
	Normandy not an absolute Monarchy	196—197
922—927	Rolf supports the Karlings against Robert and Rudolf	197—199
927 ? 932 ?	Abdication and death of Rolf	199
924	His acquisition of the Bessin ; its importance	199—202
	§ 3. <i>Reign of William Longsword.</i> 927—943.	
	Religion of Rolf ; birth and education of his son William	202—205
931	Breton revolt	205—207
	Relations between Æthelstan and the Continent ; Alan of Brittany takes refuge in England	207—209
936	Alan restored ; the Côtentin and the Channel Islands become Norman ; their subsequent history	210—213
932	Danish and Christian parties ; revolt and reduction of the Danish party	214
	William's position between the two ; Danish education of his son Richard	215—217
	Part played by William in French history ; condition of Gaul	217—221
926—933	William's fidelity to Charles the Simple ; he does homage to Rudolf after his death	221—222
936	Election of Lewis ; influence of Æthelstan	222—225
	Reign and character of Lewis ; true character of the later Karlings	226
939—940	Affairs of Montreuil and Lotharingia ; intervention of Æthelstan and Otto	227—231
942—943	Council of Attigny ; murder of William Longsword	231—232

CONTENTS.

xix

§ 4. <i>Reign of Richard the Fearless.</i> 943—996.		PAGE
A. D.		
943	Accession of Richard; his minority and doubtful legitimacy	232—233
943—973	Events of the year 943; influence of Germany in French affairs	234—235
943	New Danish settlement; apostasy of Richard; the Christians seek French help	236—237
	Lewis defeats the Danes and recovers Richard	238
	Norman version	239
944—945	Lewis in Normandy; his defeat and capture by Harold Blaataud	240—245
945—946	Lewis imprisoned by Hugh; intervention of Eadmund and Otto; release of Lewis and renewal of his Kingship	245—247
	Commendation of Richard to Hugh of Paris	247—250
	The alliance between Normandy and Paris determines the fall of the Karlings	250—251
946	War of the three Kings against the two Dukes; defeat of Otto before Rouen	251—254
947—954	Series of Synods; progress and death of Lewis	254—257
954—986	Reign of Lothar; the old generation dies off	257—258
956—960	Relations between Hugh Capet and Richard	259—260
963	Theobald of Chartres; his enmity towards Richard	260—261
	Second intervention of Harold I	262—263
	Policy of Hugh Capet; general peace between Ducal and Royal France	263—264
973—980	Changed relations between France and Germany on the death of Otto the Great	264—266
986—991	Reign of Lewis the Fifth; his death; election of Hugh Capet and final establishment of the Parisian dynasty	266—269
§ 5. <i>Comparison between France, England, and Normandy.</i>		
	Influence of the Normans on the Capetian revolution; their settlement made Gaul French	269—270
	Relations between Normandy and France fixed by the Capetian Revolution	271—272
	Contrast between England and France	273—275
	Position of the later Karlings; power of the Crown not immediately increased by the change of dynasty	275—277
	Growth of the doctrine of nobility	278—280
996	Last days and death of Richard	280—281
§ 6. <i>Early Years of Richard the Good.</i> 996—997.		
	Aristocratic feelings of Richard	281—282

A.D.		PAGE
997	Revolt of the Peasants; their political advancement; the revolt crushed by Rudolf of Ivry . . .	282—284

CHAPTER V.

THE DANISH CONQUEST OF ENGLAND. 975—1016.

Character and reign of Æthelred . . .	285—288
---------------------------------------	---------

§ 1. *Reign of Eadward the Martyr.* 975—979.

975	Death of Eadgar; reaction against the monks . . .	288—290
	Disputed election to the Crown; election of Eadward; banishment of Olaf of Northumberland . . .	290—292

§ 2. *From the Election of Æthelred to the first dispute with Normandy.*
979—991.

979	Murder of Eadward; election of Æthelred . . .	293
979—988	Death of Dunstan; various internal events . . .	293—294
980—982	Beginning of Danish inroads; characters of Swend and Olaf . . .	294—296
988—993	Beginning of Danish attempts at settlement . . .	296
991	Norwegiau invasion; Battle of Maldon and death of Brihtnoth . . .	296—303
	The Danes first bought off; Ælfric of Mercia . . .	304—306
992	Naval victory of the English; treason of Ælfric . . .	308
	Greatness of London . . .	308—311
993	Ravages in the North; treason of Godwine and others . . .	311
988—991	Affairs of Wales . . .	312—313
991	Dispute between Æthelred and Richard appeased by Pope John the Fifteenth; increasing connexion between England and Normandy . . .	313—315

§ 3. *From the first dispute with Normandy to the Massacre of Saint Brice.*
991—1002.

994	Great combined expedition of Olaf and Swend; attack on London defeated by the citizens; Æthelred buys peace . . .	315—317
994—1000	Peace with Olaf; his later days . . .	317—319
994—1003	Inaction of Swend . . .	319
995	Meetings of the Witenagemót; Ælfric elected Archbishop; Translation of the Bernician Bishoprick to Durham . . .	319—322
996—998	Gemóts of Celcyth, Calne, and London; legislation . . .	322—323

CONTENTS.

xxi

A.D.		PAGE
997—999	Renewed ravages and inefficient resistance . . .	323—324
	Causes of inefficient resistance . . .	324—327
1000	Character of Æthelred ; he ravages Cumberland . . .	327—329
	Second quarrel with Normandy ; alleged English invasion of the Côtentin . . .	330—331
1002	Marriage of Æthelred and Emma ; its results . . .	331—335
1000	Expected end of the world ; condition of Europe and Asia . . .	335—336
1001	Invasion of Sussex ; treason of Pallig ; defence of Exeter ; Battle of Penhow . . .	336—340
1001—1002	Meetings of the Witan ; fresh payments to the Danes . . .	340—342
1002	Massacre of the Danes ; its probable extent . . .	343—345

§ 4. *From the Massacre of Saint Brice to Swend's Conquest of England.*

1002—1013.

1003	Results of the Massacre ; invasion by Swend in per- son ; Exeter betrayed by Hugh the Frenchman . . .	345—346
	Renewed treason of Ælfric ; Swend sacks Salis- bury . . .	346—349
1004	Exploits of Ulfcytel of East-Anglia ; Swend burns Norwich and Thetford ; his drawn battle with Ulf- cytel . . .	349—353
1005	Year of respite and famine . . .	353
1006	Rise and character of Eadric ; murder of Ælfhelm . . .	354—357
	Malcolm of Scotland besieges Durham ; the city delivered by Uhtred . . .	357—359
1006	Great devastation of the Danes in Wessex . . .	359—361
1007	Meetings of the Witan ; tribute paid again . . .	361
1007—1008	Two years' respite ; Eadric Ealdorman of the Mer- cians . . .	362—363
1008—1009	Legislation ; decree for the formation of a fleet . . .	363—368
	The fleet raised by assessments ; origin of ship- money . . .	368—371
1009	Alleged Embassy to Normandy ; Richard's treaty with Swend . . .	371—373
	The fleet assembled at Sandwich ; quarrel of Wulf- noth and Brihtric ; dispersion of the fleet . . .	373—375
1009—1010	Invasion of Thurkill ; vain attack on London ; Ox- ford burned . . .	376—377
1010	Last year of resistance ; Ulfcytel's battle at Ring- mere ; hopeless state of the country . . .	377—382
1011	Peace again purchased ; Eadric invades Wales . . .	382—384
	Siege and capture of Canterbury ; captivity of Ælfheah . . .	384—387

A.D.		PAGE
1012	Martyrdom of Ælfheah	388—391
	Money paid to the Danes; Thurkill joins the English	391—392
1013	Swend's last invasion; the North submits	392—394
	He ravages Mercia and is repulsed from London	394—396
	The West-Saxons submit; Swend acknowledged King; London submits	396—397
1013—1014	Æthelred and his family take refuge in Normandy	397—398

§ 5. *From the Conquest of England by Swend to the Death of Æthelred.*

1013—1016.

	Importance of Swend's Conquest as preparatory to William's	399—401
1014	Death of Swend	401—403
	Double election to the Crown; the Danes choose Cnut; the English Witan vote the restoration of Æthelred	403—405
	Return and legislation of Æthelred	405—406
	Æthelred drives out Cnut; position of Thurkill	406—408
1015	Witenagemót of Oxford; murder of Sigferth and Morcere	409—411
	The Ætheling Eadmund marries Ealdgyth and esta- blishes himself in the Five Boroughs	412
	Cnut returns; he ravages Wessex and is joined by Eadric	413—414
1016	Cnut and Eadric invade Mercia; Eadmund and Uhtred in the North; submission and murder of Uhtred	414—416
	Death of Æthelred	417

§ 6. *The War of Cnut and Eadmund.* 1016.

	Double election of Cnut and Eadmund; short and glorious reign of Eadmund	418—420
	Eadmund acknowledged in Wessex; Cnut's fresh siege of London	420—421
	Battle of Pen Selwood; victory of Eadmund	422—423
	Battle of Sherstone; victory doubtful	423—425
	Cnut renews the siege of London; Eadric joins Ead- mund	425
	Battles of London and Brentford; third siege of London	426
	Cnut ravages Mercia; battle of Otford	426—427
	Battle of Assandun; final victory of Cnut	427—433
	Conference of Olney and division of the Kingdom	434—437
	Death and burial of Eadmund	437—440

CHAPTER VI.

THE DANISH KINGS IN ENGLAND. 1017—1042.

A. D.		PAGE
	Character of the Reigns of Cnut and his Sons	442—444
	§ 1. <i>The Reign of Cnut.</i> 1017—1035.	
1016—1017	Witenagemót of London; Cnut chosen King	445—446
	Outlawry of the two Eadwigs; fate of the Ætheling	446—447
	Fourfold division of England; Cnut's preference for Weesex	447—449
	First appearance of Earl Godwine	449—451
1017	Cnut marries Ælfgifu-Emma; his relations with Ælfgifu of Northampton and her sons	451—454
	Banishments and executions	454—457
	Execution and character of Eadric	458—461
	Leofwine succeeds Eadric in Mercia	461
1018	Danegeld paid; Cnut sends home most of his ships	462
	Witenagemót of Oxford, renewal of Eadgar's Law	462—465
1019	Cnut visits Denmark	465
	Exploits of Godwine; his marriage with Gytha	466—469
1020	Cnut returns to England; Witenagemót at Ciren- cester; banishment of Æthelweard	469
	Godwine Earl of the West-Saxons	469—471
	Consecration of the church on Assandun; import of the ceremony	471—473
	Later policy of Cnut; Danes make way for English- men	473
1021	Banishment of Thurkill	473—474
1023	Thurkill viceroy of Denmark	474
1023—1030	Banishment of Eric; banishment and death of Hakon	475—476
1025	Ulf put to death	476
	Character and position of Cnut	477—479
1027	His letter from Rome	479—480
1028—1035	His Laws	480—483
	Personal traditions of Cnut; his ecclesiastical foun- dations	483—488
	Peace of Cnut's reign	489
	The Housecarls; Cnut's military legislation	490—493
	Cnut's foreign policy; affairs of Wales	494
	Affairs of Northumberland and Scotland; succession of the Northumbrian Earls	495
1018	Malcolm defeats Eadwulf at Carham	495—496

A. D.		PAGE
1028 ?	Affairs of Cumberland ; submission of Duncan .	497—498
1031	Submission of Scotland ; homage of three kings .	498—500
1015	Cnut's northern wars ; loss of Norway . . .	501
1015—1028	Reign of Saint Olaf in Norway	501—503
1025	Cnut's defeat at the Helga	502
1028	Cnut chosen King of all Norway	503
	Cnut's friendly relations with the Empire ; he re- covers the frontier of the Eider	504—506
996—1031	Affairs of Normandy ; friendly relations between Normandy and France	506—508
	Affairs of Brittany and Chartres	508—509
1013 ?	Story of Olaf and Lacman	510—512
	Foreign expeditions and conquests of the Normans .	512—513
1024	Burgundian War	513—514
1018	Norman exploits in Spain	514—515
1016—1090	Conquest of Apulia and Sicily ; its bearing on that of England	515—517
1026	Unbroken peace between Richard and Cnut ; death of Richard	517
1026—1028	Reign of Richard the Third	517
1028—1031	Accession of Robert ; he restores various expelled Princes	517—519
1026	Relations between Cnut and Robert ; marriage of Robert and Estrith	520—523
1028—1035	Robert's intervention on behalf of the Æthelings ; his attempted invasion of England	524—528
1035	Pilgrimage of Robert ; deaths of Robert and Cnut .	528—530

§ 2. *The Reign of Harold the son of Cnut.* 1035—1040.

	Extent and partition of Cnut's Empire	530—533
1036	Swend expelled from Norway	533
1035—1036	Candidature of Harold and Harthacnut ; Witenage- mót at Oxford ; division of the Kingdom	534—541
1035—1037	Emma and Godwine Regents for Harthacnut in Wessex	542
1036	Attempt of the Ætheling Ælfred ; conflicting ver- sions of the story	542—550
	Estimate of the evidence ; real position of Ælfred ; real question as to the conduct of Godwine	550—553
	Inconsistency of the ordinary story	553—555
	Evidence and suspicion against Godwine ; his pro- bable innocence	555—559
	Dissatisfaction in Wessex at the absence of Hartha- cnut	560
1037	Harthacnut deposed and Harold chosen King over all England	561

CONTENTS.

xxv

A. D.		PAGE
	He banishes Emma	561—562
	His reign and character	562—564
1039	Welsh inroad and death of Eadwine	564
1040	Duncan besieges Durham and is defeated by the citizens	564—566
1039	Preparations of Harthacnut	566—567
1040	Death of Harold	567
§ 3. <i>The Reign of Harthacnut.</i> 1040—1042.		
1040	Election of Harthacnut; his landing and coronation His character; he lays on a Danegeld and digs up Harold's body	568—569 569—573
1040—1041	His second Danegeld	572—573
	Accusation, trial, and acquittal of Godwine	573—577
1041	The Danegeld levied by the Housecarls; tumult at Worcester	577—579
	Worcester burned and the shire ravaged	580—582
	Harthacnut recalls Eadward	582—584
	Succession of the Northumbrian Earls; Ealdred, Eadwulf, Siward; Siward murders Eadwulf by the connivance of Harthacnut and obtains the whole Earldom	584—588
	Harthacnut sells the See of Durham to Eadred	588—589
1042	War with Magnus; defeat of Swend Estrithson	589
	Death of Harthacnut; marriage of Tostig and Gytha; first foundation of Waltham	589—591
	Election of Eadward	592
	Summary	593—595

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.	Use of the word "English"	597
B.	The Cession of Lothian	610
C.	The Use of Imperial Titles by the English Kings	620
D.	The Death of William Longsword	627
E.	The Relations of Æthelred with Normandy	633
F.	The Origin of Earl Godwine	636
G.	The Death of Eadric	647
H.	Wyrtegeorn King of the Wends	649



ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

p. 31, note 2, for "Saxon" read "Saxons."

p. 67, l. 15. This expression is somewhat too strong. It is perfectly correct to say that no Scottish or Northumbrian sword was drawn against Eadgar himself; still, in the early part of the reign, there was at least one case of border warfare on the Scottish, as well as on the Welsh, frontier. See below, p. 619.

p. 69, side-note, for "1356" read "1536."

p. 108, note, l. 14, dele "in."

p. 114. Perhaps a still more distinct case of the deposition of a King will be found in the "forsaking" of Harthacnut by the West-Saxons in 1037. See below, p. 561.

p. 130, note 2, last line, for "on" read "from."

p. 134, l. 23. This description seems not to be quite accurate. The throne of Strathclyde seems (see Robertson's *Scotland under her Early Kings*, i. 55) to have been occupied by princes of the Scottish royal family, in the way described in p. 136, as early as 908. The Kingdom however was still quite independent of Scotland.

p. 204, note 2, for "repudiatum" read "repudiatam."

p. 210, l. 13, for "Court" read "Count."

p. 230, note, l. 5, for "one part" read "some part."

p. 236, l. 12, for "draw" read "drew."

p. 287, side-note, for "worthy leaders" read "leaders worthy."

p. 292, note 3. Mr. Robertson, vol. ii. 440, assumes that the mysterious abbreviation "hehgr" stands for "heah gerefæ." Cf. *Chron.* 1001. The letters look very like it, but one would hardly expect a title like "gerefa," implying such complete dependence on the King, to be borne by men who were only gradually sinking from the position of princes to that of Earls. This Essay of Mr. Robertson's, on "the Danelage," is one of the best parts of his book.

p. 301, note 1, for "pes" read "þes."

p. 312, note, l. 6, for "died" read "who died."

p. 320. A better parallel for the translation of the see to Durham will be found below in p. 565. Ealdhun founded the town as well as the church.

p. 401, l. 12, for "his will" read "the will."

p. 424, note 4. Another instance of this rare use of the word "Basileus" will be found in p. 626.

p. 431, l. 4 from bottom, for "closed" read "ended." Assandun (Ammatun) is described in the *Knytlinga Saga* (*Ant. Celt. Scand.* 129) as lying to the

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

north of the "Danes wood" (*bat er nordr fra Danaskogum*). This Saga claims the fight of Brentford as a victory. But its chronology is utterly confused. It makes Assandun the third battle, followed by one at Norwich, and it transfers the battle of Ringmere in 1010 (see p. 378) to this year. It also makes Eric (see p. 416) the Danish commander there.

p. 440, note 2, for "new minster" read "New Minster."

p. 441, note, for "1076" read "1074."

p. 442, l. 7. This expression, as well as some in 489, is perhaps too strong. After Cnut's power was fully established, no war took place within the English borders; but in his early days an important Scottish inroad took place, and somewhat later an English army invaded Wales. See below, pp. 494, 495.

p. 448, note 1, for "distractedly" read "distinctively."

p. 490. The *Knytlinga Saga* (*Ant. Celt. Scand.* 103) seems to attribute the formation of this force to an earlier time. The whole Danish force was doubtless in a certain sense composed of *comitatus*, but the special organization of the Thingmanna clearly dates from 1018.

p. 492, note 1, for "Court Martials" read "Courts Martial."

p. 501, side-note, for "Revolution" read "Revolutions."

p. 507, note 2, l. 2, dele "ever."

p. 522, note. The earliest Margaret I have met with, besides the sainted Queen of Scots, is the daughter of Geoffrey Count of Mortaine and wife of Henry of Beaumont Earl of Warwick, *Ord. Vit.* 676 A, 709 A. She *may* have been called after the Scottish Queen.

p. 533, l. 17, for "bequests" read "bequest."

p. 551, l. 16. On the other hand, except during the proscription in the early days of Cnut, the formal execution of a man of princely or other high rank is rare. Murders are not uncommon, but the Law seems commonly satisfied with outlawry.

p. 564, l. 17. This was the first exploit of Gruffydd the son of Llewelyn, afterwards so famous. The battle was fought at Rhydd y Groes on the Severn, near Upton in Worcestershire, a place which still retains the Welsh name. See *Brut y Tywysogion* and *Ann. Camb. in anno.*

p. 577, note 2, after "Mercians" read "at Burford."

p. 591, last line, for "firmly established on" read "already called to."


p. 610, l. 6, for "the" read "her," and last line, for "did" read "was."

p. 613. It would be worth inquiring whether any of these Ragnalds—the name is spelled in endless ways—can be identified with the Ragnald who figures at this same time in French and Norman history. See p. 186.

p. 615, l. 2 from bottom, for "refers" read "referred."

p. 649. Some further account of Godescalc will be found in the next Chapter.

THE HISTORY
OF THE
NORMAN CONQUEST OF ENGLAND.



CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Norman Conquest is the great turning-point in the history of the English nation. Since the first settlement of the English in Britain, the introduction of Christianity is the only event which can compare with it in importance. And there is this wide difference between the two. The introduction of Christianity was an event which could hardly fail to happen sooner or later; in accepting the Gospel, the English only followed the same law which, sooner or later, affected all the Teutonic nations. But the Norman Conquest is something which stands without a parallel in any other Teutonic land. If that Conquest be only looked on in its true light, it is impossible to exaggerate its importance. And yet there is no event whose true nature has been more commonly and more utterly mistaken. No event is less fitted to be taken, as it too often has been taken, for the beginning of our national history. For its whole importance is not the importance which belongs to a beginning, but the importance which belongs to a turning-point. The Norman Conquest brought with it a most extensive foreign infusion, which affected our blood, our language, our laws, our arts; still it was only an infusion; the older and stronger elements still survived, and in the long run they again made good their supremacy. So far from being the beginning of our national macy.

Import-
ance of the
Norman
Conquest,
not as the
beginning
of English
history, but
as its chief
turning-
point.

CHAP. I. history, the Norman Conquest was the temporary overthrow of our national being. But it was only a temporary overthrow. To a superficial observer the English people might seem for a while to be wiped out of the roll-call of the nations, or to exist only as the bondmen of foreign rulers in their own land. But in a few generations we led captive our conquerors; England was England once again, and the descendants of the Norman invaders were found to be among the truest of Englishmen. England may be as justly proud of rearing such step-children as Simon of Montfort and Edward the First as of being the natural mother of Ælfred and of Harold. In no part of history can any event be truly understood without reference to the events which went before it and which prepared the way for it. But in no case is such reference more needful than in dealing with an event like that with which we are now concerned. The whole importance of the Norman Conquest consists in the effect which it had on an existing nation, humbled indeed, but neither wiped out nor utterly enslaved, in the changes which it wrought on an existing constitution, which was by degrees greatly modified, but which was never either wholly abolished or wholly trampled under foot. William, King of the English, claimed to reign as the lawful successor of the Kings of the English who reigned before him. He claimed to inherit their rights, and he professed to govern according to their laws. His position therefore, and the whole nature of the great revolution which he wrought, is utterly unintelligible without a full understanding of the state of things which he found existing. Even when one nation actually displaces another, some knowledge of the condition of the displaced nation is necessary to understand the position of the displacing nation. The English Conquest of Britain cannot be thoroughly understood without some knowledge of the earlier history of the Celt and

Import-
ance of the
earlier
English
history to
the right
under-
standing
of the
Conquest.

the Roman. But when there is no displacement of a nation, CHAP. I.
when there is not even the utter overthrow of a constitution, when there are only changes, however many and important, wrought in an existing system, a knowledge of the earlier state of things is an absolutely essential part of any knowledge of the later. The Norman Conquest of England is simply an insoluble puzzle without a clear notion of the condition of England and the English people at the time when the Conqueror and his followers first set foot upon our shores.

The Norman Conquest again is an event which stands by itself in the history of Europe. It took place at a transitional period in the world's developement. Those elements, Roman and Teutonic, Imperial and Ecclesiastical, which stood, as it were, side by side in the system of the early middle age, were then being fused together into the later system of feudal, papal, crusading, Europe. The Conquest itself was one of the most important steps in the change. A kingdom which had hitherto been purely Teutonic was brought within the sphere of the laws, the manners, the speech, of the Romance nations. At the very moment when Pope and Cæsar held each other in the death-grasp, a church which had hitherto maintained a sort of insular and barbaric independence was brought into a far more intimate connexion with the Roman See. And, as a conquest, compared with earlier and with later conquests, it holds a middle position between the two classes, and shares somewhat of the nature of both. It was something less than such conquests as form the main subject of history during the great Wandering of the Nations. It was something more than those political conquests which fill up too large a space in the history of modern times. It was much less than a national migration; it was much more than a mere change of frontier or of dynasty. It was not such a change as when

Character
of the Nor-
man Con-
quest as
compared
with earlier
and later
Conquests.

The im-
mediate
change ef-
fected by

CHAP. I.
the Norman Conquest less than the change effected by the Barbaric conquests.

In what the change really consisted.

Formal legislative changes for the most part of a later date.

the first English conquerors slew, expelled, or enslaved the whole nation of the vanquished Britons. It was not such a change as when Goths or Burgundians sat down as a ruling people, preserving their own language and their own law, and leaving the language and law of Rome to the vanquished Romans. But it was a far greater change than commonly follows on the transfer of a province from one sovereign to another, or even on the forcible acquisition of a crown by an alien dynasty. The conquest of England by William wrought less immediate change than the conquest of Africa by Genseric; it wrought a greater immediate change than the conquest of Sicily by Charles of Anjou. It brought with it not only a new dynasty, but a new nobility; it did not expel or transplant the English nation or any part of it, but it gradually deprived the leading men and families of England of their lands and offices, and thrust them down into a secondary position under alien intruders. It did not at once sweep away the old laws and liberties of the land; but it at once changed the manner and spirit of their administration, and it opened the way for endless later changes in the laws themselves. It did not abolish the English language; but it brought in a new language by its side, which for a while supplanted it as the language of polite intercourse, and which did not yield to the reviving elder tongue till it had affected it by the largest infusion that the vocabulary of one European tongue ever received from another. The most important of the formal changes in legislation, in language, in the system of government and in the tenure of land, were no immediate consequences of the Conquest, no mere innovations of the reign of William. They were the developements of a later age, when the Norman as well as the Englishman found himself under the yoke of a foreign master. The distinct changes in law and government which we commonly

attribute to William the Norman belong, in truth, in by far the greatest number of cases, to his great-grandson Henry the Angevin. But the reign of William paved the way for the reign of Henry; had not William's military conquest gone before, Henry could have found no opportunity for his administrative revolution. And the immediate changes were, after all, great and weighty, not the less great and weighty because they affected the practical condition of the people far more than they affected its written laws and institutions. When a nation is driven to receive a foreigner as its King, when that foreign King divides the highest offices and the greatest estates of the land among his foreign followers, though such a change must be carefully distinguished from changes in the written law, still the change is, for the time, practically the greatest which a nation and its leaders can undergo.

CHAP I.

Importance of the reign of Henry the Second.

Immediate results of the Conquest mainly practical.

I propose then, as a necessary introduction to my narrative of the actual Conquest, to sketch the condition of England and of Normandy at the time when the two nations came into contact with each other. This process will involve a summary of the earlier history of both countries. From the beginning of the eleventh century the history of England and of Normandy becomes more and more intermixed, and it will be necessary to tell the story more and more in detail. The period of the actual Conquest and its immediate causes, the reigns of Eadward, of Harold, and of William, will form the centre of the work. The reigns of William's sons will show the character of the Norman government in England, and the amount of immediate change which it really brought with it. With the accession of the Angevin dynasty the purely Norman period comes to an end. Norman and Englishman alike have to struggle for their own against the perpetual intrusion of fresh shoals of foreigners, a process almost equivalent to a second Conquest. The

Plan and extent of the present History.

Narrative of the actual Conquest and its immediate causes. 1042-1066.

Accession of the Angevin dynasty. 1154.

CHAP. I. natural effect of this struggle was that Norman and Englishman forgot their differences and united in resistance to the common enemy. Under the great Henry, the ruler and lawgiver of this second Conquest, the struggle is for a while delayed, or veils itself under an ecclesiastical form. A Prelate, of English birth but of the purest Norman descent, wins the love of the English people in a struggle in which nothing but an unerring instinct could have shown them that their interest was in any way involved. Under Richard, the most thoroughly foreign of all our Kings, the evil reaches its height, and England becomes a mere province of Anjou. As is usual in cases of national discontent, it is not till the worst day is passed that the counter-revolution openly begins. Under John and his son Henry, the history of England becomes mainly the history of a struggle between the natives of the land, of whatever race, and the foreign favourites who devoured the substance of both. During the process of this struggle the Old-English liberties are won back in another form, and the modern constitution of England begins. At last, in the person of the great Edward, the work of reconciliation is completed. Norman and Englishman have become one under the best and greatest of our later Kings, the first who, since the Norman entered our land, either bore a purely English name or followed a purely English policy. Under him England finally assumed those constitutional forms which, with mere changes of detail, she has preserved uninterrupted ever since. The work of the Conquest is now over; the two races are united under a legislation whose outward form and language was in a great measure French, but whose real life was drawn from the truest English sources. Here then our narrative, even as the merest sketch, comes to its natural close. But, for a long time before this point, a mere sketch, pointing out the working of earlier events in their results, will be all

Reign of
Henry the
Second.

1154-1189.

Degrada-
tion of
England
under
Richard
the First.

1189-1199.

National
struggle
against
foreigners.

1214-1266.

1265.

Close of
the subject
under Ed-
ward the
First.

1272-1307.

that will be needed. The kernel of my narrative will contain somewhat less than an hundred years, the latter half of the eleventh century and the earlier years of the twelfth. This will give the history of the actual Conquest, introduced, as is essential to its understanding, by a slighter sketch of the events which led to it, and wound up, as is hardly less essential, by another sketch slighter still of the permanent results which it left behind it. CHAP. I.

CHAPTER II.

FORMATION OF THE KINGDOM OF ENGLAND.

449-975.

§ 1. *The Heathen period of English Conquest.* 449-597.

The races and languages of Britain essentially the same at the time of the Norman Conquest as they are now.

Preservation of local names and divisions in England.

THE Norman invaders in the eleventh century found in the Isle of Britain, as any modern invader would find now, three nations, speaking three languages, and they found, then as now, one of the three holding a distinct superiority over the whole land. Then, as now, English, Welsh, and Gaelic were the three distinct tongues of the three races of the island; then, as now, the dominant Teuton knew himself by no name but that of Englishman, and was known to his Celtic neighbour by no name but that of Saxon. The boundaries of the two races and of their languages were already fixed, nearly as they remain at present. The English tongue has made some advances since the eleventh century, but they are small compared with the advances which it had made between the fifth century and the eleventh. The main divisions of the country, the local names of the vast mass of its towns and villages, were fixed when the Norman came, and they have survived, with but little change, to our own day. While a map of France or Germany in the eleventh century is useless for modern purposes, and looks like the picture of another region, a map of England proper in the reign of Victoria hardly differs at all from a map of England proper in the reign of William. The Norman

found in the land substantially the same English nation which still exists, occupying substantially the same territory which it occupies at present. He found it already exhibiting, in its laws, its language, its national character, the most essential of the features which it still retains. Into the English nation which he thus found already formed his own dynasty and his own followers were gradually absorbed. The conquered did not become Normans, but the conquerors did become Englishmen. It was by a very different process that the English themselves had made good their footing in the land in which the Norman found them, and to which they had already long ago given their name.

CHAP. II.
The Norman element absorbed in the English nation then and now existing.

The details of the English Conquest of Britain, and the exact amount of historical truth to be found in them, are questions which hardly concern us here. It will be enough to point out the essential difference between the traditional narrative of the English Conquest, as contained in the English Chronicles,¹ and the romantic narrative of which Geoffrey of Monmouth is the chief spokesman. The narrative in the Chronicles is one perfectly credible in itself, and perfectly consistent with all the undoubted phenomena of later history. It is also perfectly consistent with the record of all those living witnesses whose testimony may be mistaken, but which themselves cannot lie. Such are the evidence of language and local nomenclature, the evidence of the surviving antiquities, the camps, the dykes, the barrows, which chronicle this warfare as well as the

The English Conquest of Britain.
A.D. 449-924.

General credibility of the traditional narrative.

¹ On this subject I must refer, once for all, to the papers of Dr. Guest in the *Archæological Journal* and in the volumes of *Transactions of the Archæological Institute*, especially to the paper on the *Early English Settlements in South Britain in the Salisbury Volume*. On these questions I have little to do except to profess myself, in all essential points, an unreserved follower of that illustrious scholar. Of the difference between *historical, traditional, mythical, and romantic narratives* I have treated at some length in an article in the *Fortnightly Review*, May 1st, 1866.

CHAP. II. warfare of earlier and of later times. The only question is, whether an accurate narrative of details can have been handed on from the date assigned to Hengest to the ascertained date of Bæda, whether by oral tradition, by runes, or by written documents which are lost to us. And this really amounts to little more than a question whether, in the earliest part of the narrative, the exact names and the exact dates can always be trusted. Some of the earlier names may be mythical,¹ some of the dates may have been reached by ingenious calculation rather than by genuine tradition. But, granting all this, the main substance of the narrative remains essentially where it was.

Questions
of earlier
Teutonic
invasions
and settle-
ments in
Britain.

Much learning and ingenuity has been spent, and, I venture to think, in many cases wasted, in attempts to show the untrustworthiness of the traditional account, by bringing forward proofs of Teutonic invasions, and even of Teutonic settlements, of an earlier date than that assigned by the Chronicles to the beginning of the English Conquest.² The facts which are brought forward are in most cases probable and in some cases certain, but I cannot look on them as having that bearing on later history which they have sometimes been supposed to have. It is possible that, among the tribes which Cæsar found in Britain, especially in the eastern districts of the island, some may have been of Teutonic origin, or in some degree mingled

¹ It is really hardly worth while to dispute about the names of Hengest and Horsa. The evidence for their historical character seems to me at least as strong as the suspicion of their mythical character. But whether the chiefs who led the first Jutish settlers in Kent bore these names or any other does not affect the reality of the Jutish settlement. I must confess however that there are names in the Chronicles which strike me as far more suspicious than those of Hengest and Horsa. I mean names like Port and Wihtgar, who figure in the entries for 501 and 544. See Earle's *Parallel Chronicles*, p. ix.

² For all that is to be said on this side of the question, see the eleventh chapter of Palgrave's *English Commonwealth* and the first chapter of Kemble's *Saxons in England*. On the other hand see Dr. Guest's paper in the *Salisbury Volume*.

with Teutonic elements. It is certain that, in Britain, as everywhere else, Teutonic soldiers largely served in the Roman armies, and that settlements of such soldiers sometimes grew into permanent colonies.¹ It is certain that, long before the days of Cerdic or Hengest, Theodosius and Stilicho repelled Teutonic invasions, and it is probable that, by repelling such invasions, they hindered the formation of Teutonic settlements in Britain at that earlier time.² But these facts or probabilities do not affect the credibility of the recorded course of the English Conquest, or of the tradition which fixes its real beginning in the middle of the fifth century. Teutonic settlements before the Roman invasion, or under the Roman domination, would be something quite different from the Teutonic invasions recorded from the fifth century onwards. Teutonic tribes subdued by the Roman arms, or Teutonic soldiers settled by the Roman government, would sink into the general mass of Roman subjects; they would retain no strong national feeling; they would most likely not even retain their national language. The only way in which they could possibly influence the later history would be by

The course of the English Conquest not affected by them.

¹ See Guest, *Salisbury Volume*, p. 35.

² The account in *Amianus* (xxvii. 8) of the exploits of the elder Theodosius does not speak of the Saxons or of any other Teutons as invaders of Britain, but only of Gaul. But there seems quite evidence enough to show that, at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries, Britain was constantly ravaged by Saxon pirates. This is shown by the well-known phrases of *Limes Saxonicus* and *Littus Saxonicum*, for the true explanation of which I must again refer to Dr. Guest. The Saxon shore or march, like the Welsh march in England, like the Spanish, Slavonic, and other marches of the Empire, was, not a district occupied by Saxons, but the march—in this case a shore—lying near to the Saxons and exposed to their ravages. Claudian also constantly couples the Saxons with the Picts and Scots as among the invaders of Roman Britain repulsed by Theodosius and Stilicho.

“*Maduerunt Saxone fuso
Orcades : incaluit Pictorum sanguine Thule :
Scotorum cumulos fleuit glacialis Ierne.*”

Carm. viii. 31. Cf. xviii. 392. xxii. 255.

CHAP. II. making the establishment of the later Teutonic settlers a less difficult matter in those parts of the country which they occupied than in those where the population was purely Celtic or Roman.¹ We may admit the fact that the Teutonic, indeed the distinctively Saxon, invasions began, not in the fifth century, but in the fourth. But the true bearing of this fact will be best understood by comparing the Saxon invasions with the later and better known invasions of the Danes both in England and in Gaul. In the Danish invasions I shall presently endeavour to establish three periods, one of mere plunder, one of settlement, one of political conquest. For the last of these three there was no opportunity under the circumstances of the earlier Teutonic invaders, but for the first two stages we may fairly look in the history of the English, as well as in that of the Danish, Conquest. The Saxon pirates against whom the Roman government found it needful to establish so elaborate a system of defence, find their parallels in those Danish plundering expeditions which ravaged various parts of England in the latter half of the eighth century and the former half of the ninth, and in the ravages inflicted on Neustria by chieftains earlier than Hasting. The Anglian, Saxon, and Jutish settlements of the fifth and sixth centuries answer to the settlements of Guthrum in East Anglia in the ninth century and of Rolf in Gaul in the tenth. Even if it be held that the Saxons who were driven back by Theodosius and Stilicho contemplated settlement and not merely plunder, still, as they were hindered in their intentions, the case remains much the same. The Teutons were baffled in their attempt at a settlement in the fourth century; they succeeded in their attempt at a settlement in the fifth. The general history of the Conquest, as handed down to us in the Chronicles, is therefore in no way affected by the certain

Light
thrown
on these
events by
the ana-
logy of the
Danish
invasions.

878.

912.

¹ Yet even this view seems to be pretty well disposed of by Dr. Guest; u. s.

fact of earlier incursions, by the possible fact of much earlier settlements. The real effect of the Saxon invasions of the fourth century seems to have been this : the Saxon name became familiar to the Celtic inhabitants of Britain earlier than the Anglian name; consequently Saxon, and not Angle or English, has been the name by which the Teutonic immigrants in Britain have been known to their Celtic neighbours from that day to this.¹

What then the English Chronicles profess to record is, not these early and transient incursions which led to no permanent result, but that series of constant, systematic, successful, attempts at settlement on the part of various Teutonic tribes which constituted the English Conquest of Britain. Early in the fifth century the Roman legions were withdrawn from the island, and the former provincials were left to defend their new and precarious independence how they might. Harassed as the Southern Britons doubtless were by the Picts and Scots who had never submitted to the Roman yoke, there is no absurdity in the familiar story that a British Prince took Teutonic mercenaries into his pay, and that these dangerous allies took advantage of the weakness of their hosts to establish themselves as permanent possessors of part of the island. But, if this account be rejected, the general narrative of the Conquest is in no way affected; and, if it be accepted, we may be sure that Vortigern's imitation of many Roman precedents did but hasten the progress of events. The attempts which had been checked while the Roman power was flourishing were sure to be renewed when the check was withdrawn, and if a Welsh King did invite a Jutish

¹ I use the word "Saxon" throughout only in its correct sense, to express one only among several Teutonic tribes which settled in Britain. The name "Saxon" was never used by the people themselves to express the whole nation, which was called, sometimes "Anglo-Saxon," but, far more commonly, simply "Angle" or "English." I shall discuss this point more at length in an Appendix. (A.)

CHAP. II. chieftain to defend him, that invitation was only the occasion, and not the cause, of the Conquest which now began.

449-597. We cannot seriously doubt that, in the course of the fifth and sixth centuries, a succession of tribes of kindred origin, all of them of the same Low-Dutch¹ stock, and speaking essentially the same Low-Dutch language, landed at various points of the British coast, gradually forced their way inland, and founded permanent Teutonic Kingdoms. Before

Extent of the English dominion and of the independent British states at the end of the sixth century.

the end of the sixth century the Teutonic dominion stretched from the German Ocean to the Severn, and from the English Channel to the Firth of Forth. The northern part of the island was still held by Picts and Scots, tribes whose exact ethnical relation to each other hardly concerns us.² And the whole west side of the island, including not only modern Wales, but the great Kingdom of Strathclyde, stretching from Dumbarton to Chester, and the great peninsula containing Cornwall, Devon, and part of Somerset, was still in the hands of independent Britons. The

¹ I use, as a technical term, this correct and old-fashioned description of the class of languages to which our own belongs. The English language is simply Low-Dutch, with a very small Welsh, and a very large Romance, infusion into its vocabulary. The Low-Dutch of the continent, so closely cognate with our own tongue, is the natural speech of the whole region from Flanders to Holstein, and it has been carried by conquest over a large region, originally Slavonic, to the further east. But, hemmed in by Romance, High-Dutch, and Danish, it is giving way at all points, and it is only in Holland that it survives as a literary language. It should always be borne in mind that our affinity in blood and language is, in the first degree, with the Low-Dutch, in the second degree with the Danish. With the High-Dutch, the German of modern literature, we have no direct connexion at all.

² The proper Scots, as no one denies, were a Gaelic colony from Ireland, the original Scotia. The only question is as to the Picts or Caledonians. Were they another Gaelic tribe, the vestige of a Gaelic occupation of the island earlier than the British occupation, or were they simply Britons who had never been brought under the Roman dominion? The geographical aspect of the case favours the former belief, but the weight of philological evidence seems to be on the side of the latter. But the question is one which, as far as purely English history is concerned, may safely be left undetermined.

struggle had been a long and severe one, and the natives often retained possession of a defensible district long after the surrounding country had been occupied by the invaders. It is therefore quite possible that, even at the end of the sixth century, there may have been within the English frontier inaccessible points where detached bodies of Welshmen still retained a precarious independence. It is still more probable that, within the same frontier, there still were Roman towns, tributary to the conquerors rather than occupied by them.¹ But by the end of the sixth century even these exceptions must have been few. The work of the Conquest, as a whole, was accomplished. The Teutonic settlers had occupied by far the greater part of the territory which they ever were, in the strictest sense, to occupy. The complete supremacy of the island was yet to be won; but that was to be won, when it was won, by quite another process.

CHAP. II.

The English Conquest, as a whole, accomplished by 597.

The English Conquest of Britain differed, in several important respects from every other settlement of a Teutonic people within the limits of the Roman Empire. Everywhere else the invaders gradually adopted the language and the religion of the conquered. If the conquerors were heathens at the time of their settlement, they gradually adopted Christianity. If they had already adopted Christianity in its Arian form, they gradually exchanged their heretical creed for that of the Catholic Church. Everywhere but in Britain the invaders gradually learned to speak some form, however corrupt, of the language of Rome. The Teutonic conquerors of Italy, Spain, and Gaul have indeed infused into the Romance

Points of difference between the English Conquest and other Teutonic conquests.

Gradual Romanization of the conquerors elsewhere in religious language &c.

¹ It seems quite certain that the English seldom, if ever, at once occupied a Roman or British town. The towns were commonly forsaken for a while, though they were in many cases resettled by an English population. The only question is whether the towns, in any cases, preserved a sort of half independence after the conquest of the surrounding country.

CHAP. II. languages of these countries a large proportion of words of Teutonic origin. Still the language of all those countries remains essentially Latin; the Teutonic element in them is a mere infusion. Everywhere but in Britain the invaders respected the laws and arts of Rome. The Roman Law was preserved, side by side with the Barbaric codes, as the rightful heritage of the conquered people; and, in the process of ages, the Roman Law gradually recovered its position as the dominant code of a large portion of continental Europe. Everywhere but in Britain the local divisions and local nomenclature survived the Conquest. Nearly every Gaulish tribe recorded by Cæsar has left its name still to be traced on the modern map.¹ In Britain everything is different. The conquer-

Retention by the English of their Teutonic language and heathen worship.

History of the English language—a Low-Dutch tongue with a Romance infusion.

ing English entered Britain as heathens, and, after their settlement in Britain, they still retained the heathen worship of their fathers. They were at last converted to Christianity, but it was not by the Christians whom they found in the island, but by a special mission from the common ecclesiastical centre. Our Bishopricks and ecclesiastical divisions are not, as in Gaul, an heritage of Roman times, representing Roman political divisions. Our episcopal sees are foundations of later date than the English Conquest, and the limits of their dioceses answer, not to anything Welsh or Roman, but to the boundaries of ancient English principalities. And, as the English in Britain retained their religion, so they also retained their language, and retained it far more permanently. A few Celtic, and a still fewer Latin,² words found their way

¹ In Northern Gaul the name of the tribe is commonly preserved in the modern name of its chief town, the original name of the town itself being dropped. Thus Lutetia Parisiorum has become Paris. But in Aquitaine and Provence, the cities commonly retain their original names, as Bourdeaux and Toulouse.

² Words like *street* and *chester*; this class is excessively small. See Max Müller, *Science of Language*, Second Series, p. 269.

into English from the first days of the Conquest, and a somewhat larger stock of Latin ecclesiastical terms¹ was naturally brought in by the Christian missionaries. But, with these two very small classes of exceptions, the English language retained its purely Low-Dutch character down to that great infusion of Romance words into our vocabulary which was a result, though not an immediate result, of the Norman Conquest. And, to

this day, though the Romance infusion divides the vocabulary of our dictionaries with our natural Teutonic speech, it still remains only an infusion, an infusion greater in degree, but essentially the same in kind, as the Teutonic infusion into the Romance languages. As it is impossible to put together the shortest French sentence without the use of Romance words, so it is impossible to put together the shortest English sentence without the use of Teutonic words. But it is possible to compose sentence after sentence of French without a single Teutonic word, and it is equally possible to compose sentence after sentence of English without a single Romance word. In Britain too the arts of Rome perished as utterly as the language and the religion of Rome; arts, language, and religion were all brought back again at a later period and in a corrupted form. The laws of Rome perished utterly; they exercised no influence upon our insular jurisprudence, until, in times after the Norman Conquest, the Civil Law was introduced as something utterly exotic. And even then our insular jurisprudence was too strong for it; the Imperial legislation never gained that supremacy which it gained in most parts of the Continent, and even in the Scottish portion of our island. In England again the local nomenclature is throughout essentially Teutonic. A few great cities and a few great natural objects, London on the Thames and Gloucester on the Severn, still retain names

¹ Words like *Mass*, *Priest*, *Bishop*, *Angel*, *Candle*.

CHAP. II.

older than the English Conquest; but the great mass of the towns and villages of England bear names which were given them either by the Angles and Saxons of the fifth and sixth centuries or by the Danes of the ninth and tenth. In short, though the utter extirpation of a nation is an impossibility,¹ there is every reason to believe that the Celtic inhabitants of those parts of Britain which had become English at the end of the sixth century had been as nearly extirpated as a nation can be. The women would doubtless be largely spared,² but as far as the male sex is concerned, we may feel sure that death, emigration, or personal slavery were the only alternatives which the vanquished found at the hands of our fathers. The nature of the small Celtic element in our language would of itself prove the fact. Nearly every Welsh word which has found its way into English expresses some small domestic matter, such as women and slaves would be concerned with; nearly all the words belonging to the nobler occupations, all the terms of government and war, and nearly all the terms of agriculture, are thoroughly Teutonic. In short, everywhere but in Britain an intruding nation sat down by the side of an elder nation, and gradually lost itself in its mass. In Britain, so far as such a process is possible, the intruding nation altogether supplanted the elder nation. The process of the Conquest again, its gradual character, the way in which the land was won, bit by bit, by hard fighting, was of itself widely different from the Gothic settlements in Italy or Spain. This peculiar character of the English Conquest would of

Probable
extirpation
of the Cel-
tic inhabi-
tants.

Nature of
the Celtic
element in
English
confirms
this view.

Difference
in the ac-
tual pro-
cess of the
Conquest
in Britain
and else-
where.

¹ I mean the extirpation of anything worthy to be called a nation, of any people who had attained the position to which all the inhabitants of the Roman Empire had attained. The dying out of savage tribes before the arts and arms of highly civilized Europeans is another matter.

² Yet the legend of Hengest's daughter, as told by Nennius—her name Rowena is a later absurdity—absolutely worthless as a piece of personal history, seems to point to the fact that the invaders brought their women with them, at least to some considerable extent.

itself favour the complete displacement of the former inhabitants, by giving the remnant of the vanquished in any district the means of escape to those districts which were yet unconquered. CHAP. II.

This remarkable contrast between the English Conquest of Britain and the other Teutonic settlements within the Empire seems to be due to two main causes. The position of Britain differed from that of Italy or Gaul or Spain, and the position of the Angles and Saxons differed from that of Goths, Burgundians, or even Franks. The event alone might seem to show that the Roman occupation of Britain had not brought about so complete a Romanization of the country as had taken place in Gaul and Spain. The evidence of language looks the same way. In Spain and in Gaul the ante-Roman languages survive only in a few out-of-the-way corners; the speech of the land is Roman. But in Britain whatever is not English is not Roman but Celtic. The surviving Britons retained, and still retain, their own native language and not the language of their Roman conquerors. It would seem that the Roman occupation of Britain was, after all, very superficial, and that, when the legions were withdrawn, things largely fell back into their ancient barbarism. The English therefore found a more stubborn, because a more truly national, resistance in Britain than their Teutonic kinsmen found elsewhere. But, on the other hand, they did not find that perfect and striking fabric of Roman laws, manners, and arts which elsewhere impressed the minds of the conquerors, and changed them from destroyers into disciples. Again, the Goths above all, and the Franks in some degree, had long been familiar with Rome. in peace and in war. They had resisted Roman attempts at conquest and they had repaid them in kind. They had served in the Roman armies, and had received lands and honours and offices as the reward

Causes of the difference.
Britain less thoroughly Romanized than Gaul and Spain.
Familiarity of the other Teutons with Roman civilization.

CHAP. II.

The Eng-
lish utterly
ignorant
of it.

Results of
the pecu-
liar charac-
ter of the
English
Conquest.

of their services. They were, in short, neither wholly ignorant of Roman civilization nor utterly hostile to it. But our forefathers came from lands where the Roman eagle had never been seen, or had been seen only during the momentary incursions of Drusus and Germanicus. They had never felt the charm which led Gothic Kings to glory in the title of Roman Generals, and which led them to respect and preserve the forms of Roman civilization and the monuments of Roman art. Our forefathers appeared in the Isle of Britain purely as destroyers; nowhere else in Western Europe were the existing men and the existing institutions so utterly swept away. The English wiped out everything Celtic and everything Roman as thoroughly as everything Roman was wiped out of Africa by the Saracen conquerors of Carthage. A more fearful blow never fell on any nation than the landing of the Angles and Saxons was to the Celt of Britain. But we may now be thankful for the barbarism and ferocity of our forefathers. Had we stayed in our earlier land, we should have remained undistinguished from the mass of our Low-Dutch kinsfolk. Had we conquered and settled only as Goths and Burgundians conquered and settled, we should be simply one more member of the great family of the Romance nations. Had we been a colony sent forth after the mother country had attained to any degree of civilization, we might have been lost like the Normans in Sicily or the Franks in Palestine. As it was, we were a colony sent forth while our race was still in a state of healthy barbarism. We won a country for ourselves, and grew up, a new people in a new land, bringing with us ideas and principles common to us with the rest of our race, but not bringing with us any of the theories and prejudices which have been the bane of later colonization. Severed from the old stock, and kept aloof from intermixture with any other, we ceased to be Germans and we did not become

Britons or Romans. In our new country we developed our system for ourselves, partly by purely native growth, partly by independent intercourse with the common centre of civilization. The Goth is merged in the Romance population of Italy, Spain, and Aquitaine; the Old-Saxon has lost his national being through the subtler proselytism of the High-German; but the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, transplanted to the shores of Britain, have won for themselves a new name and a new national being, and have handed on to us the distinct and glorious inheritance of Englishmen. CHAP. II.

Thus, before the end of the sixth century, by far the greater and more fertile portion of Britain had become heathen and Teutonic. The land had been occupied by various tribes; and most probably, as always happens in such migrations, all the settlers had not been perfectly homogeneous. A certain following of allies or subjects of other races is almost sure to follow under the shadow of the main body. But it is clear that that main body was so distinctly and predominantly of Low-Dutch blood and speech as to swallow up any foreign elements which may have accompanied it during its migration, as well as any that it may have incorporated during the process of the Conquest or after its completion. Three kindred tribes, Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, are, in the common national tradition, said to have divided the land among them in very unequal proportions. For Saxons a contemporary foreign notice substitutes all tribes of one common stock, all speaking mere dialectic varieties of one common tongue. From the very beginning of the

¹ Prokopios, Bell. Goth. iv. 20. Βριτανίαν δὲ τὴν νῆσον ἔθνη τρία πολυ-
ανθρωπύτατα ἔχουσι, βασιλεὺς τε εἰς αὐτῶν ἐκάστω ἐφέστηκεν. τὰ δὲ
κεῖται τοῖς ἔθνεσι τοῦτοις Ἀγγιλοὶ τε καὶ Φρίσσοι καὶ οἱ τῇ νήσῳ δυνάμει δὲ
Βρίττωνες. Prokopios' account of Britain is mixed up with a great deal of
fable, but here at least is something clear and explicit.

CHAP. II.

Conquest, all the Teutonic settlers, without distinction, are spoken of as belonging to "the English kin."¹ To trace out, by the evidence of local nomenclature or otherwise, the exact extent of the settlements of these various kindred tribes is highly curious and interesting as a matter of antiquarian and philological research. But the results of such inquiries are of little importance for the purpose of such a sketch as the present. Long before the Norman Conquest the various Low-Dutch tribes in Britain had been fused into the one English nation. The distinction between Angle and Saxon had become merely provincial. To the united nation the Angle had given his name, the Saxon had given his royal dynasty; the Jute, the least considerable in the extent of his territorial possessions, had been, according to all tradition, the first to lead the way to a permanent settlement, and he had undoubtedly been honoured by supplying the ecclesiastical centre from which Christianity was spread over the land. If Wessex boasted of the royal capital of Winchester, Kent boasted no less proudly of the spiritual metropolis of Canterbury.

The various Teutonic tribes in Britain fused into one nation before the Norman Conquest.

The old notion of a regular Heptarchy inaccurate,

The old notion of an Heptarchy, of a regular system of seven Kingdoms, united under the regular supremacy of a single over-lord, is a dream which has passed away before the light of historic criticism. The English Kingdoms in Britain were ever fluctuating, alike in their number and in their relations to one another. The number of perfectly independent states was sometimes greater and sometimes less than the mystical seven, and, till the beginning of the ninth century, the whole nation did not admit the regular supremacy of any fixed and permanent over-lord. Yet it is no less certain that, among the mass of smaller and more obscure principalities, seven Kingdoms do stand out in a marked way, seven Kingdoms of which it is possible

yet seven Kingdoms more conspicuous than others.

¹ See the Chronicles under the years 443 and 449, and compare 473, where Hengest and his Jutes are again called "Engle."

to recover something like a continuous history, seven CHAP. II.
 Kingdoms which alone supplied candidates for the domi-
 nion of the whole island. First comes the earliest perma-
 nent Teutonic settlement in Britain, the Jutish Kingdom Kent.
 of Kent. The direct descendants of Hengest reigned over ^{449-823.}
 a land, which, as the nearest portion of Britain to the con-
 tinent, has ever been the first to receive every foreign
 immigration, but which, notwithstanding, prides itself to
 this day on its specially Teutonic character and on the
 retention of various old Teutonic usages which have
 vanished elsewhere. Besides Kent, the Jutes formed no <sup>[The Jutes
of Wight.
530-686.]</sup>
 other strictly independent state. Their only other settle-
 ment was a small principality, including the Isle of Wight
 and part of Hampshire, whose history is closely connected
 with that of the great Saxon Kingdom in its immediate
 neighbourhood, in which it was at last merged. The <sup>The three
Saxon
Kingdoms.</sup>
 remainder of the English territory south of the Thames,
 together with a small portion to the north of that river,
 formed the three Kingdoms of the Saxons, the East, the
 South, and the West, whose names speak for themselves.
 Among these Sussex and Essex fill only a secondary part
 in our history. The greatness of Sussex did not last <sup>Sussex.
477-823.</sup>
 beyond the days of its founder Ælle, the first Bretwalda.
 Whatever importance Essex, or its offshoot Middlesex, <sup>Essex.
526-823.</sup>
 could claim as containing the great city of London was of
 no long duration. We soon find London fluctuating
 between the condition of an independent commonwealth
 and that of a dependency of the Mercian Kings. Very
 different was the destiny of the third Saxon Kingdom.
 Wessex has grown into England, England into the United <sup>Wessex.
519-1866.</sup>
 Kingdom, the United Kingdom into the British Empire.
 Every prince who has ruled England before and since the
 eleventh century¹ has had the blood of Cerdic the West-

¹ It is necessary to make this limitation, because the Danish Kings, Harold the son of Godwine, and William the Conqueror, were none of

CHAP. II. Saxon in his veins. At the close of the sixth century Wessex had risen to high importance among the English Kingdoms, though the days of its permanent supremacy were still far distant. Step by step, from a small settlement on the Hampshire coast, the West-Saxons had won their way, fighting battle after battle against the Welsh, and, after nearly every battle, extending their borders by a new acquisition of territory. At the time of which I speak they held the modern counties of Hampshire, Berks, 577-584. Wilts, Dorset, part of Somerset, with a considerable dominion north of the Avon, including the counties of Gloucester and Worcester, and an undefined territory stretching northwards along the valley of the Severn.¹ But this northern dominion was not lasting; the Thames and the Avon became the permanent boundaries of Wessex to the north. The Somersetshire Axe, and the forests on the borders of Somersetshire and Wiltshire, separated the Kingdom from the independent Britons to the West.

The three Anglian Kingdoms. North of the Thames lay the three great Kingdoms of the Angles. One of these, probably the most purely Teutonic realm in Britain,² occupied the great peninsula, or rather island,³ between the fens and the German Ocean, which received from them the name of East-Anglia. Far to the north, from the Humber to the Forth, lay the great realm of the Northumbrians, sometimes united under a single prince, sometimes divided by the Tyne or the Tees into

East-Anglia.
571-870.
Northumbria.
547-876.

them of the West-Saxon house. But all our earlier Kings were descended from Cerdic in the male line and all our later Kings in the female line.

¹ I have given the boundaries somewhat roughly, as they do not exactly answer to those of the present counties. For details I must refer to Dr. Guest's paper already quoted, and to the two later ones in the *Archæological Journal*, vol. xvi. p. 105, and vol. xix. p. 193.

² Yet some of the passages collected by Sir Francis Palgrave (*English Commonwealth*, i. 462) would seem to show that parties of independent Welshmen held out in the fen country till a very late date.

³ On the quasi-insular character of East-Anglia, see Dr. Stanley's paper in the Norwich volume of the *Proceedings of the Archæological Institute*, p. 58.

the two Kingdoms of Bernicia and Deira. Both these CHAP. II.
Kingdoms have a large sea-board, but they are not, like
Wessex, distinctly attributed to a personal founder from
beyond sea. The first recorded King of the Northum-
brians is Ida, who began to reign in 547 ; ¹ the first
recorded King of the East-Angles is Offa, who began to
reign in 571.² These dates give the beginnings of the
Kingdoms, but they do not give the beginnings of the
English settlements in those countries. What Ida and
Offa did was apparently to unite districts ruled by several
independent, or at most confederated, Ealdormen into a
single Kingdom. Meanwhile, in the middle of Britain, Mercia,
a power equal to any of the others was growing up, in ^{584-877.}
which the same process is still more plainly to be dis-
cerned. The Kingdom of the Mercians, the march or
border-land against the Welsh, appears at the end of the
sixth century as a powerful state, but it has no distinctly
recorded founder, no distinctly recorded date of origin.³
It seems to have grown up from the joining together of Peculiar
a great number of small principalities, probably of much character
of Mercia,

¹ The Chronicles, under the year 547, record the accession of Ida, and speak of him as the ancestor of the following line of Northumbrian Kings. But we are not told, as in the cases of Hengest, Ælle, and Cerdic, anything about his landing, and the phrase "Ida feng to rice" (cf. 519) implies that this was not the beginning of the settlement. I therefore cannot help suspecting that there is some truth in the legend preserved by Nennius (38), according to which settlers of the kindred of Hengest occupied Northumberland in the preceding century. William of Malmesbury (i. 7) follows the same account, with additional details, but distinctly adding that no English chief in those parts took the title of King before Ida.

² The date of Offa is given by Henry of Huntingdon (Mon. Hist. Brit. 714a). But he had before (M.H.B. 712a) said, speaking of the days of Cerdic, "Ea tempestate venerunt multi et sæpe de Germania, et occupaverunt East-Angle et Merce: sed necdum sub uno rege redacta erant. Plures autem procures certatim regiones occupabant." This marks the transition from Ealdormanship to Kingship, of which I shall speak in my next chapter.

³ Crida or Creoda is mentioned in the Chronicles (593), but he is not said to have been the first King of the Mercians. That he was so is a conjecture of Henry of Huntingdon, M. H. B. 714 c.

CHAP. II. more varied origin than the different portions of the other
 as an union of small states of different origins. Kingdoms. The prevailing blood was Anglian, but it is certain that the Mercian Kingdom was considerably enlarged by conquest at the expense of the Saxon race. The West-Saxon conquests north of the Avon, the principalities of the Hwiccas and the Magesætas,¹ were cut off from the West-Saxon body, and were constrained, along with all the other states of Mid-England, to admit the Mercian supremacy. Mercia, throughout its history, appears far more divided than any other part of England, the result, no doubt, of its peculiar origin. But it must not be supposed that the other Kingdoms formed compact or centralized monarchies. Wessex was an union of several kindred principalities, each having its own Ealdorman or Under-King, though united under one supreme chief. At one time five West-Saxon Kings appear in a single battle.² So in Kent there were Kings of East and West Kent, a fact which has left its memory in our ecclesiastical arrangements to the present day. No other English shire contains two Bishopricks; the two sees of Canterbury and Rochester still bear witness to the existence of two distinct Kingdoms within the present shire. So, in East-Anglia, the two divisions of the race, the North and the South Folk, have left their almost unaltered names to two modern counties. But in these cases the principalities seem to have been formed by separate, though kindred, detachments of colonists, each of them ruled by a prince of the one royal house. In Wessex each successive conquest from the Welsh seems to have formed a new principality; but the national unity of the West-Saxon people was never lost, and it does not appear that any but princes of the line

628!

Minor
 principalities in the
 other
 Kingdoms.

¹ The Magesætas answer to the present county of Hereford, the Hwiccas to the old diocese of Worcester, that is to the counties of Worcester, Gloucester, and part of Warwick.

² Chronicles, 626. cf. 654.

THE BRETWALDAS.

of Cerdic ever ruled within their borders. But in Mercia CHAP. II.
 a crowd of wholly independent principalities seen to have
 been gradually united under one common rule—a type of
 the fate which the whole island was destined to undergo,
 though not at the hands of Mercia.

Such were the territorial divisions of Teutonic Britain
 at the end of the sixth century. Among a crowd of lesser
 states seven principal Kingdoms stand out conspicuously
 dominant. And I do not hesitate to add that it was by The supremacy of the Bretwaldas.
 no means unusual for the sovereign of one or other of
 these states to acquire, whether by arts or arms, a certain
 dominion over the rest, a dominion which presented the
 aspect of an acknowledged, though probably not a very
 well-defined, supremacy. The famous title of Bretwalda¹
 is applied by one version of the Chronicles to eight princes
 of various English Kingdoms. The other versions give
 the name in various other forms,² and Bæda records the
 fact of their dominion without giving them any special
 title.³ The form, the origin, the exact force, of the title
 matters little for my present purpose, but so significant a
 description cannot be given without a meaning. Eight
 Kings, of six different Kingdoms, including all except
 Essex and Mercia, are distinctly said to have possessed a

¹ Sir Francis Palgrave represents the tendency to make the most of the
 Bretwaldadom, which he labours hard to represent as a continuation of the
 Imperial dominion of the provincial Emperors in Britain. This notion,
 which I shall discuss more fully in my next Chapter, seems to me to rest
 on very slight grounds. On the other hand Mr. Kemble (*Saxons in Eng-*
land, Book ii. c. 1) is equally determined to make as little as possible of
 the Bretwaldadom. He brings strong arguments against the usual form
 and the received etymology of the name; but the distinct testimony of Bæda
 to the supremacy of certain Kings remains just where it was whether we
 give them any special title or not. The strange thing is that the list, as given
 in the Chronicles, leaps from the latest name in Bæda to Ecgberht without
 taking in Offa or any other of the powerful Kings of the eighth century.

² *Brytenwalda*, *Bretenanwealda*, *Brytenwealda*, *Brytenweald*.

³ Bæda, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 5. It is hardly safe to build anything, as a writer of
 Sir F. Palgrave's school might do, on the mere use of the word *imperium*.

CHAP. II. certain supremacy over the rest of their fellows. Such a statement as this cannot be lightly cast aside. The list, it should be remarked, does not form a continuous series, and it ends, after a considerable gap, with the prince who established in one Kingdom a lasting supremacy over all the rest. We may surely recognize in the list the record of earlier attempts at establishing a supremacy of the same kind, a supremacy which was more or less fully acknowledged at the time, but which the princes who held it failed to hand on to their successors. I do not attempt to be wise above what is written, or to define anything with precision as to the nature of a supremacy of which we have such slight records. I only claim that the clear testimony of our authorities should be received as far as it goes. And in that testimony I venture to see the first attempts at that union of the whole English race which was at last carried out by the West-Saxon Kings of the ninth and tenth centuries.

The supremacy of the Bretwaldas a fact, though its nature and extent are doubtful.

§ 2. *Conversion of the English to Christianity.* 597-681.

The last years of the sixth century were marked by a change hardly less important than the first settlement of the Teutonic tribes in Britain. The Christian Faith, which the English had despised or passed by unheeded as the creed of the conquered Welsh, was now set before them by a special mission from the city which still commanded the reverence of all Western Europe. Kent, under its
597. King Æthelberht, who then held the rank of Bretwalda,¹ became the first Christian Kingdom, and Canterbury be-

¹ That the Bretwaldadom of Æthelberht carried with it some real dominion beyond the limits of Kent is shown by the ease with which Augustine went and held a synod in a distant part of England and one still heathen. (See Bæda, ii. 2.) This could hardly be except by virtue of a safe-conduct from the common over-lord. Indeed Bæda's words are explicit—"adjutorio usus Ædilbercti regis."

came the first Christian city, the spiritual metropolis of the English nation. To the vanquished Welsh the conquering Saxons and Angles had never listened, but no sooner had the Roman missionaries begun their work than another Christian element was brought in from the north, at the hands of the already converted Picts and Scots. Sectarian differences divided the two parties, and led to controversies which threatened to tear the infant Church in pieces. Christian Kings and Kingdoms apostatized; heathen Kings overthrew the champions of the new faith in battle; but, amidst all these fluctuations, Christianity gradually made its way. And in no part of the world did Christianity make its way in a more honourable manner. We nowhere read of any of those persecutions, those conversions at the point of the sword, which disgraced the proselytizing zeal of the Frankish and Scandinavian apostles of the Faith. Of the first Christian prince in England, it is distinctly told us that, while still a heathen, he hindered none of his subjects from embracing Christianity, and that, after he was himself converted, he constrained none to forsake their ancient faith.¹ In less than a century all the English Kingdoms had fully accepted Christianity, and they had distinctly preferred its Roman to its Scottish form. Before the end of the seventh century, the spiritual conquest of Britain was completed by the entrance of the South-Saxons into the fold of Christ; and, in the course of the eighth century, the insular Teutons showed themselves of those most zealous of missionaries for the conversion of their continental brethren who still remained in heathen darkness. Bishopricks were gradually founded, in the limits of each diocese commonly answering to those of a Kingdom or principality. The supremacy of Kent at the beginning of the conversion, the supremacy of Northumberland at the stage when Christianity was first preached to the

CHAP. II.

Controversies between the Roman and Scottish parties.

Christianity makes its way in England without violence.

Conversion of Sussex, the last heathen part of Britain. 681.

English missionaries on the Continent.

597.

627.

¹ See Bede, Hist. Ecol. i. 25, 26.

CHAP. II. northern English, is still shown to this day in the metropolitan position of Canterbury, the city of the Bretwalda Æthelberht, and of York, the city of the Bretwalda Eadwine. The land was speedily covered with churches and monasteries, the distinction between regulars and seculars being, during the missionary period, not very accurately drawn. Our forefathers soon acquired a fair share of the learning of the age, and the first two centuries after the conversion form a brilliant period in our ecclesiastical history, one which seems the more brilliant from the contrast with the time of renewed heathenism and darkness, which, in a large portion of Britain, was to follow it.

Effects of
the conver-
sion of the
English.
Their former iso-
lated po-
sition.

Instances
of con-
nexion
with the
Franks in
Gaul.

The conversion of the English to Christianity at once altered their whole position in the world. Hitherto our history had been almost wholly insular; our heathen forefathers had had but little to do, either in war or in peace, with any nations beyond their own four seas. We hear little of any connexion being kept up between the Angles and Saxons who were settled in Britain, and their kinsfolk who abode in their original country.¹ The little intercourse that we read of seems to be wholly with the Franks who now bore rule on the opposite coast of Gaul. Englishmen seem once, in the sixth century, to have found their way to the Imperial Court, but it was in company with the ambassadors of a Frankish prince, who at least tried to represent himself as the suzerain of Britain.² One instance of connexion between

¹ One hardly knows what to make of the wild story in Prokopios (Bell. Goth. iv. 20) about an English princess making war on her faithless lover, Radiger, King of the Varni. Cf. Kemble, i. 23.

² Prokop. Bell. Goth. iv. 20. οὐ πολλῶ πρότερον ὁ Φράγγων βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ πρεσβείᾳ τῶν οἱ ἐπιτηδείων τινὰς παρὰ βασιλέα Ἰουστινιανὸν ἐς Βυζάντιον στείλας ἄνδρας αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν Ἀγγέλων ξυνέπεμψε, φιλοτιμούμενος ὥς καὶ ἡ νῆσος ἦδε πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρχεται.

I cannot put so much reliance as Mr. Kemble does (Saxons in England, i. 25) on the expressions of a German ecclesiastical writer, on which he

Britain and Gaul may have had some indirect effect in promoting the work of conversion. English Kings then, and long after, commonly intermarried with English women, the daughters either of other English princes or of their own nobles. But the Bretwalda Æthelberht, before the landing of Augustine, was already married to a Frankish princess, who retained her Christian religion in his heathen court. Such a fact is chiefly remarkable for its strangeness; yet it points to a considerable amount of intercourse between Kent and the Franks of Paris at this particular moment. Still, up to the end of the sixth century, Britain, as a whole, was cut off from the rest of the world. It was a heathen and barbarous island, where the Christian Faith was professed only by an obscure remnant, which, in some remote corners, beyond the reach of the invaders, still retained a form of Christianity which, after all, was not the orthodoxy of the Old or of the New Rome. By its conversion England was first brought, not only within the pale of the Christian Church, but within the pale of the general political society of Europe. But our insular position, combined with the events of our earlier history, was not without its effect on the peculiar character of Christianity as established in England. England was the first great territorial¹

builds up a theory of insular Saxons aiding the Frank Theodoric in a war with the Thuringians. The author of the Translation of Saint Alexander (Pertz, ii. 674) is not speaking of any particular detachment of Saxons from Britain coming over to Germany to take a part in a particular war. By a strange perversion, this writer of the ninth century derives the continental Saxons, as a nation, from the English in Britain. "*Saxonum gens, sicut tradit antiquitas, ab Anglia Britanniae incolis egressa, per Oceanum navigans Germaniae litoribus studio et necessitate quaerendarum sedium appulsa est.*" On this the editor remarks, "*More solito traditio res gestas invertit, ita ut Saxones non à Saxonia Britanniam, sed ex Britannia Saxoniam appulisse dicantur.*" The legend is no doubt a corruption of the legendary origin of the Saxon given by Widukind, i. 3-6.

¹ The Mæso-Goths in the fourth century were the first Teutonic nation to embrace Christianity, but they were still a wandering tribe, while the

CHAP. II. conquest of the spiritual power, beyond the limits of the Roman Empire, beyond the influence of Greek and Roman civilization. Italy, Spain, Gaul, Africa, the Greek East and the remoter Churches of doubtful loyalty and orthodoxy, were all either actually under the sway of Cæsar, or retained distinct traces of the recent times when they had been so.¹ When Æthelberht received baptism, the political sway of Rome still reached from the Ocean to the Euphrates, and the language of Rome was the one civilized speech from the Ocean to the Hadriatic. Strictly national Churches existed only in those lands of the further East, where the religious and the political loyalty of Syrians and Egyptians was already equally doubtful, and which were destined to fall away at the first touch of the victorious Saracen. In England, alone in the West, a purely national Church arose. One great error indeed was committed; the vernacular tongue did not become the language of public worship. The mistake was natural. It had occurred to no man to translate the Latin services, drawn up at a time when Latin was the universal language of the West, into those provincial dialects, the parents of the future Romance tongues, which might already be growing up in Gaul and Spain. We should as soon think of translating the Prayer-Book into the dialects of Somersetshire or Yorkshire. Led thus to look on Latin as the one tongue of worship, as well as of literature and government, Augustine and his successors failed to remark that Teutonic England stood in a wholly different position from Romanized Gaul and Spain. They

England
the first
strictly
national
Church in
the West.

Error of
not em-
ploying the
English
language
in public
worship.

conversion of England was a distinct territorial conquest. Armenia again, at the other end of the Roman world, was a territorial conquest more ancient than that of England, but Armenia lay far more open to Imperial influences than England did.

¹ I am now on ground which I have often touched on in articles in the *Edinburgh* and *North British Reviews*. For a summary I would refer to the first chapter of my *History and Conquests of the Saracens*.

failed to remark that the same reasons which required that men should pray in Latin at Rome required that they should pray in English at Canterbury. The error was pardonable, but in its effects it was great. Still, though England had not vernacular services, she soon began to form a vernacular literature, sacred and profane, poetical and historical, to which no other nation of the West can supply a parallel. The English Church, reverencing Rome, but not slavishly bowing down to her, grew up with a distinctly national character, and gradually infused its influence into all the feelings and habits of the English people. By the end of the seventh century, the independent, insular, Teutonic, Church had become one of the brightest lights of the Christian firmament.

In short, the introduction of Christianity completely changed the position of the English nation both within their own island and towards the rest of the world. From this time the amount of intercourse with other nations steadily increased, and the change of religion had also a most important effect within the island itself. The morality of the Gospel had a distinct influence upon the politics of the age. The Evangelical precepts of peace and love did not put an end to war, they did not put an end to aggressive conquest, but they distinctly humanized the way in which war was carried on. From this time forth the never-ending wars with the Welsh cease to be wars of extermination. The heathen English had been satisfied with nothing short of the destruction or expulsion of their enemies; the Christian English thought it enough to reduce them to political subjection. This is clearly marked in the advance of Wessex towards the West. Twenty years before the coming of Augustine, Ceawlin, the West-Saxon Bretwalda, had won the great battle of Deorham, he had taken the cities of Bath, Gloucester, and Cirencester, he had then carried his arms northward, and in his northern

CHAP. II.

Practical effect of Christianity. The wars with the Welsh no longer wars of extermination.

Advance of Wessex. Conquests of Ceawlin. 577-584.

CHAP. II. march he had destroyed the Roman city of Uriconium. These northern conquests, as we have seen,¹ were in a certain sense temporary; the districts overrun by Ceawlin beyond the Avon permanently ceased to be Welsh, but they did not become permanently West-Saxon. But the land between the Avon and the Axe, the northern part of modern Somersetshire, became a permanent portion of the West-Saxon realm. This was the last heathen conquest, the last exterminating conquest, waged by the West-Saxons against the Britons. During a space of three hundred years, the process of West-Saxon conquest still went on; step by step the English frontier advanced from the Axe to the Parret, from the Parret to the Tamar; Taunton at one stage, Exeter at another, were border fortresses against the Welsh enemy; step by step the old Cornish Kingdom shrank up before the conquerors, till at last no portion of land south of the Bristol Channel was subject to a British sovereign. This was conquest, and, no doubt, fearful and desolating conquest, but it was no longer conquest which offered the dreadful alternatives of death, banishment, or personal slavery. The Christian Welsh could now sit down as subjects of the Christian Saxon. The Welshman was acknowledged as a man and a citizen; he was put under the protection of the law; he could hold landed property; his blood had its price, and his oath had its ascertained value.² The value set on his life and on his oath shows that he was not yet looked on as the equal of the conquering race; but the Welshman within the West-Saxon border was no longer a wild beast, an enemy, or a slave, but a fellow-Christian living under the King's peace. There can be no doubt that the great peninsula

Further
advances
of the
West-
Saxons.
652-926.

In these
later wars
the Welsh
are allowed
to become
West-
Saxon
subjects.

¹ See above, p. 24.

² See the Laws of Ine, 23, 24, 32, 33, 46, 54, 74. (Thorpe, *Laws and Institutes*, i. 119-149. Schmid, pp. 30-55.) In the time of Ælfred the distinction, at least within the strictly English territory, seems to have died out.

stretching from the **Axe** to the **Land's End** was, and still CHAP. II.
 is, largely inhabited by men who are only naturalized Eng-
 lishmen, descendants of the Welsh inhabitants, who gra-
 dually lost their distinctive language, and became merged
 in the general mass of their conquerors. In fact, the ex-
 tinction of the **Cornish** language in modern **Cornwall** within Celtic element still remaining in the western counties of Wessex.
 comparatively recent times was only the last stage of a pro-
 cess which began with the conquests of **Cenwealh** in the
 seventh century. The Celtic element can be traced from
 the **Axe**, the last heathen frontier, to the extremities of
Cornwall, of course increasing in amount as we reach
 the lands which were more recently conquered and there-
 fore less perfectly Teutonized. **Devonshire** is less Celtic
 than **Cornwall**, and **Somersetshire** is less Celtic than
Devonshire, but not one of the three counties can be
 called a pure Teutonic land like **Kent** or **Norfolk**. The
 same rule would doubtless apply to those less accurately
 recorded conquests by which the **Mercian Kings** extended
 their dominion from the **Severn** to the modern bound-
 aries of **Wales**. We have now everywhere passed the age
 of extermination, and have entered on the age marked by
 the comparatively harmless process of political conquest.

8. Fluctuations of Dominion between Northumberland, Mercia, and Wessex. 577-823.

During the seventh and eighth centuries there were History of the seventh and eighth centuries ;
 many fluctuations in the relative position of the **English**
 kingdoms. Not only **Essex**, but **Sussex** and **East-Anglia**,
 each of which had given the nation a single **Bretwalda**,
 sank into insignificance, and even **Kent** falls into quite a kingdom
 secondary position. **Wessex** stood higher, but its **Kings**, of **Wessex**
 occupied with extending their western frontier, made as
 yet no attempt to acquire the supremacy of the whole
 island, and they often had no small difficulty in main-
 taining it.

CHAP. II. taining their own independence against Northumbrians
 Rivalry of Mercia and Northum- and Mercians. The rivalries of these last two powers
 berland. fill for a long while the most important place in our
 Greatness history. At the end of the sixth century and the begin-
 of North- ning of the seventh, Northumberland was at the height
 humber- of its power. Its King Æthelfrith stands forth in the
 land at the pages of Bæda¹ as the mightiest of conquerors against the
 beginning of the Welsh, and as checking an invasion of Picts and Scots
 period. at the great battle of Dægsanstan. It must always be
 603. borne in mind that, at this time and long after, Lothian
 was politically as well as ethnologically English, and that
 Picts and Scots—whatever was the amount of distinction
 between them—are to be looked for only north of the
 Dominion of Ead- Forth. Eadwine, the first Christian King of Northum-
 wine. berland, and who ranks as the fifth Bretwalda, has left his
 617-633. name to the frontier fortress of Eadwinesburh or Edin-
 burgh. Eadwine was a true Bretwalda in every sense
 of the word, exercising a supremacy alike over Teutons
 626. and Britons.² Five Kings of the West-Saxons fell in
 battle against him;³ but at last he died at Heathfield in
 633. battle against Penda, the heathen King of the Mercians.
 Along with Penda appeared a strange ally, the Christian
 Cadwalla, the last of his race who could boast of having
 Reign of Penda of Mercia. carried on aggressive war, as distinguished from mere
 627-655. plundering inroads, into the territory of any English
 641. people. Not long afterwards, Oswald, the restorer of the
 Northumbrian Kingdom, and the sixth Bretwalda, fell in
 another battle against the heathen Mercian. The arms of
 Penda were no less successful against the West-Saxons.

¹ Bæda, i. 34. Chron. 603, 605. The latter year is the date of his victory over the Welsh near Chester and the famous massacre of the monks of Bangor.

² Bæda, ii. 5. "Majore potentiâ cunctis qui Britanniam incolunt, Anglorum pariter et Brittonum populis præfuit, præter Cantuariis tantum, necnon et Mevanias Brittonum insulas quæ inter Hiberniam et Britanniam sitæ sunt, Anglorum subjecit imperio." Cf. c. 9.

³ See above, p. 26.

Even before the overthrow of Eadwine, he had annexed to Mercia the northern conquests of Ceawlin,¹ and sixteen years later, Cenwealh, who afterwards appears as an extender of the West-Saxon frontier at the expense of the Welsh, was for a while driven from his Kingdom by the same terrible enemy. Penda, in short, came nearer to achieving the union of the whole English nation under one sceptre than any prince before the West-Saxon Ecgberht. Everything looked as if the permanent dominion of Britain were destined for Mercia, and even as if the faith of Christ were about to be plucked up out of the land before it had well taken root. But it was impossible that England should now fall back under the rule of a mere heathen conqueror. The dominion of Penda appears in our history as a mere passing tyranny, and, though he must have possessed more real power than any one English prince had done before him, his name finds no place on the list of Bretwaldas. At last, the seventh prince who bore that title, Oswiu of Northumberland, checked him in his last invasion, and slew him in the battle of Wingfield, a name which, obscure as it now sounds, marks an important turning-point in the history of our island. The strife between the creeds of Christ and of Woden was there finally decided; the Mercians embraced the religion of their neighbours, and Northumberland again became the leading power of Britain. Under her two Bretwaldas, Oswald and Oswiu, the English dominion was, seemingly for the first time, extended beyond the Forth, and Picts and Scots, as well as English and Britons, admitted the supre-

CHAP. II.

628.

644.

Extent of his dominion.

Death of Penda. 655.

Greatness of Northumberland under Oswald, Oswiu, and Ecgfrith. 635-685.

¹ This is the interpretation which I put on the words of the *Chronicles* under the year 628. "Cynegils and Cwichelm (the West-Saxon Kings) fought with Penda at Cirencester and made an agreement there." This I take to mean the cession of the country of the Hwiccas and Ceawlin's other conquests north of the Avon. The transfer of this district from Wessex to Mercia is undoubted, and this is the most likely time.

- CHAP. II. macy of the Northumbrian King.¹ But the greatness of Northumberland lasted no longer than the reigns of Oswiu and his son Ecgfrith. Ecgfrith was slain in battle against the Picts; the northern dominion of Northumberland died with him, and the Kingdom itself, which had been for a while the most flourishing and advancing state in Britain, became utterly weakened by intestine divisions. It sank into utter insignificance, and stood ready, as we shall soon see, for the irruption of a new race of conquerors. After the decline of Northumberland, the Christian Mercians are again seen on the road to that supremacy which had once been so nearly grasped by their heathen forefathers. The fall of Penda carried with it a momentary subjugation of Mercia to Northumberland, but the land almost immediately recovered its independence, and in the next century Mercia again advanced from independence to dominion. Under three bold and enterprising Kings, Æthelbald, Offa, and Cenwulf, the armies of Mercia went forth conquering
- 685.
- Greatness of Mercia. 716-819.
- 655-656.
- Æthelbald, 716-757.
Offa, 757-795.
Cenwulf, 796-819.

¹ Sir Francis Palgrave (ii. cccix.) attributes a dominion over the Picts and Scots to Eadwine. The words of Bæda however (ii. 5, see above, p. 36) seem to me to exclude it; he attributes to him a dominion over the Britons only, that is the Welsh (probably of Strathclyde), as distinguished from the Picts and Scots. The language of Bæda in that passage would seem to imply that Oswiu was the first to extend the power of Northumberland beyond the Forth. After describing the dominion of Eadwine he adds, "Sextus Oswald et ipse Nordanhymbrorum rex Christianissimus, iisdem finibus regnum tenuit; septimus Osuii frater ejus, æqualibus pene terminis regnum nonnullo tempore coercens, Pictorum quoque atque Scottorum gentes, quæ septentrionales Britanniæ fines tenent, maximâ ex parte perdomuit ac tributarias fecit." So afterwards (iii. 24), "Osuii . . . qui gentem Pictorum maximâ ex parte regno Anglorum subjecit." Yet elsewhere (iii. 6) he attributes to Oswald also a dominion over Picts and Scots: "Denique omnes nationes et provincias Britanniæ, quæ in quatuor linguas, id est Brittonum, Pictorum, Scottorum et Anglorum, divisæ sunt, in ditione accepit." It should be remembered that there was a strange family connexion between the Pictish royal family and that of Bernicia, and the words just quoted might imply a voluntary acceptance of Oswald on the part of the northern tribes. If so, they must have revolted during the commotions which followed the death of Oswald, and must have been subdued by Oswiu. His position is clearly described as that of a conqueror.

and to conquer, and the periods of momentary confusion CHAP. II. which divided these three vigorous reigns seem to have been no serious hindrance to the general advance of the Kingdom. Wessex was still engaged in its long struggle with the Welsh, and was in no position to aspire to the dominion of Britain. It was quite as much as the West-Saxon Kings could do to push their conquests against the Welsh on the one hand and to maintain their independence against Mercia on the other. Wessex was more than once invaded by the Mercians; at one time it became actually tributary, till Cuthred, in the middle of the eighth century, finally secured its independence in the 752. fight of Burford. In the latter half of that century, Offa raised the Mercian Kingdom to a greater degree of real power than it had ever held, even during the momentary dominion of Penda. He conquered from the Welsh the lands between the Severn and the Wye, a permanent and useful acquisition for the English nation, which he is said to have secured by the great dyke which still bears his name. On the other side of Britain, all the smaller states, East-Anglia, Essex, Kent, and Sussex, were brought more or less completely under his power. Victorious over all enemies within his own island, Offa, as the mightiest potentate of the West, corresponded on equal terms with the Great Charles, the mightiest potentate of the East.¹ Occasional mis- understandings between the two princes seem not to have the Influence of Charles the Great in English affairs. seriously interrupted their friendship. It is possible that the Kentish Kings applied for help against Offa to the 808. mighty Frank; it is more certain that, after Offa's death, Charles, now Emperor, procured the restoration of the banished Northumbrian King Eardwulf,² and there seems

¹ Vita Offæ Secundi, p. 21. "Ego Karolus Regum Christianorum Orientalium potentissimus, vos, O Offane, Regum Occidentalium Christianorum potentissime, cupio lætificare," &c. The expression is singular enough to be worth quoting, though it is found in a most suspicious quarter. ² Eginhard, Ann. 808. Eardwulf is distinctly described as being re-

CHAP. II. reason to believe that both the Northumbrian and his Scottish neighbours acknowledged themselves the vassals of the new Augustus.¹

Accession
of Ecg-
berht of
Wessex.
800.

After the death of Offa the greatness of Mercia continued for a while undiminished under the reign of his son Cenwulf. But meanwhile the seeds of a mighty revolution were being sown. A prince, taught in the school of adversity, who had learned the arts of war and statecraft at the feet of the hero of the age, was, in the sixth year after Offa's death, raised to the throne of the West-Saxons. He was destined to achieve a dominion for which that narrow and local description seemed all too mean. Once, and seemingly once only, in the hour of victory, did the eighth Bretwalda, the founder of the permanent supremacy of Wessex, venture to exchange his ancestral title of King of the West-Saxons for the prouder style of KING OF THE ENGLISH.²

§ 4. *Permanent Supremacy of Wessex.* 823-924.

Analogy
between
Charles
and Ecg-
berht.

Ecgberht was chosen King of the West-Saxons in the same year in which Charles the Great was chosen Em-

stored by the legates of the Emperor and the Pope. "Per legatos Romani Pontificis et Domni Imperatoris in regnum suum reducitur." Eardwulf's homage seems to be attested in a letter from the Pope, Leo the Third, to Charles. All the passages bearing on Charles' relations to the Northumbrians and Scots are collected and discussed by Palgrave, i. 484.

¹ Eginhard, Vita Kar. 16. "Scotorum quoque Reges sic habuit ad suam voluntatem per munificentiam inclinatos, ut eum numquam aliter nisi *dominum*, seque *subditos et servos ejus*, pronunciarent." One would suppose that the Scots both of Ireland and of Britain are included. This mention of the Scots comes between the dealings of Charles with Alfonso of Galicia and those with Haroun al Rashid. The relation of the Scots was probably a case of *commendation*, a term on which I shall enlarge hereafter.

² Ecgberht's titles commonly run, "Rex," "Regali fretus dignitate," "Occidentalium Saxonum Rex," once "Rex Occidentalium Saxonum necnon et Cantuariorum" (830. Kemble, Cod. Dipl. i. 289), but in one Charter of 828 (Cod. Dipl. i. 287) he appears as "Ecgberhtus gratia Dei REX ANGLORUM." In that year he had granted out Mercia to an under-King and had reduced all the Welsh to submission.

peror. And we can hardly doubt that the example of his illustrious friend and host was ever present before his eyes. He could not indeed aspire, like Charles, to the diadem of the Cæsars, but he could aspire to an analogous rank in an island which men sometimes counted for a separate world. He could win for his own Kingdom a permanent superiority over all its neighbours, and so pave the way for the day when all England and all Britain should acknowledge only a single King. The eighth Bretwalda not only established a power over the whole land such as had been held by no other prince before him, but he did what no other Bretwalda had ever done, he handed on his external dominion as a lasting possession to his successors in his own Kingdom. From this time forward, Wessex remained the undisputed head of the English nation. The power of the West-Saxon Kings might be assaulted, and at last overthrown, by foreign invaders, but it was never again disputed by rival potentates of English blood. In short, as Charles founded the Kingdom of Germany, **Ecgbert** at least laid the foundations of the Kingdom of **England**. In his reign of thirty-six years he reduced all the English Kingdoms to a greater or less degree of subjection. The smaller states seem to have willingly submitted to him as a deliverer from the power of Mercia. East-Anglia became a dependent ally; Kent and the smaller Saxon Kingdoms were more closely incorporated with the ruling Kings of the old line continued to While in East-Anglia the West-Saxon over-lord, Kent, Essex, and Sussex were united into a still more dependent realm, which was granted out as an apanage to some prince of the West-Saxon royal house.¹ Northumberland, torn by civil dissensions, was in no position to withstand the

Permanent supremacy now established in Wessex.

Ecgbert the founder of the Kingdom of England.

The Gradual submission of the other states. 800-836. Kent, &c. 823. [See Chron. in anno.]

¹ One can hardly describe these relations between the different states without using such words as "homage," "apanage," and the like, though of course they were quite unknown in England at the time.

CHAP. II. power which was growing up in the south of Britain.

Submission of North-
humber-
land.
827.
Final
struggle
with
Mercia.
800-827.

823. At the approach of a West-Saxon army the Northumbrians seem to have submitted without resistance, retaining, like East-Anglia, their own line of vassal Kings. But Mercia was won only after a long struggle. Ecgberht had inherited war with Mercia as an inheritance from his predecessors. The first year of his reign, before he had himself returned to assume the crown to which he had been chosen, was marked by a successful resistance to a Mercian inroad.¹ And even many years after, one of the greatest victories of his reign, the fight of Ellandun, was a victory over Mercian invaders within the West-Saxon realm. That victory deprived Mercia of all her external dominion; it was immediately after it that Ecgberht annexed the smaller Kingdoms which had become Mercian dependencies. Four years later, Mercia herself had to submit to the conqueror, and though she retained her Kings for another half century, yet they now received their crown at the hands of the West-Saxon over-lord. It is immediately after recording this greatest of Ecgberht's triumphs that the Chronicles give him in a marked way the title of Bretwalda.

Submission of Mercia.
827.
828-874.

Successes
of Ecg-
berht over
the Welsh.
813-835.

It was immediately after the submission of Mercia that Ecgberht received the far more easily won submission of Northumberland, which completed his work of welding all the Teutonic kingdoms of Britain into one whole. But, while thus occupied, he had also to carry on the usual warfare with his Celtic neighbours. The power of the Cornish Britons was now utterly broken. The long struggle which had gone on ever since the days of Cerdic was now over; the English frontier seems

¹ A local invasion of the Hwiccas was repelled at Kempsford by the Wilssetas. The Hwiccas now act as Mercian subjects; but the war seems to have been quite local, carried on by the Ealdormen of the two shires.

to have been extended to the Tamar,¹ and the English supremacy was certainly extended to the Land's End. CHAP. II.
823.
The Welsh however within the conquered territory still retained their distinct existence, and they sometimes, with 835. the aid of foreign invaders, strove to cast off the yoke. Against the North-Welsh,² that is the inhabitants of Wales proper, Ecgberrht was equally successful. As Lord of Mercia he inherited from the Mercian Kings a warfare against them as constant as that which he had inherited from his own ancestors against the Welsh of Cornwall. As soon therefore as he had established his supremacy over Mercia, he went on to require and to 828. receive the submission of the Celtic neighbours of his new dominion. From this time forth all the Celtic inhabitants of Britain south of the Dee were vassals of the West-Saxon King. But his power seems not to have North and West Welsh vassals of Wessex. extended over the Picts, the Scots, or the Strathclyde Welsh. In fact, the northern Celts, except so far as Independence of Picts, Scots, and Strathclyde Welsh. they came in for their share of the Danish invasions, enjoyed, from about this time, a century of unusual independence. The power of Northumberland had long been unequal to maintaining its old supremacy over its Celtic neighbours, and the new over-lord of Northumberland seems not to have attempted to enforce it. Ecgberrht therefore, when at the height of his power, was not Lord of the whole Isle of Britain. To win that title was the work of the West-Saxon conquerors of the next century.

¹ I infer this from the description of the battle of Gafulford in 823, which is said to have been fought between the Welsh and the men of Devon, who must therefore have been English, or at least acting in the English interest. Yet Devonshire, and even the city of Exeter, remained partly Welsh as late as the time of Æthelstan.

² North-Wealas in the Chronicles means the inhabitants of Wales in the modern sense, both North and South; they are opposed to the West-Wealas, the Welsh of Cornwall.

CHAP. II.
Invasions
of the
Danes.
787-1070.

787.
[Chron. in
anno.]

833.

835.

836.

But, just as the West-Saxon monarchy was reaching this pitch of greatness, it was threatened by an enemy far more formidable than any that could be found within the four seas of Britain. We have now reached the time of the Danish invasions. The Northern part of Europe, peopled by a race closely akin to the Low-Dutch, and speaking another dialect of the common Teutonic speech, now began to send forth swarms of pirates over all the seas of Europe, who from pirates often grew into conquerors. They were still heathens, and their incursions, both in Britain and on the continent, must have been a scourge almost as frightful as the settlement of the English had been to the original Britons. The incursions of the Northmen began before the accession of Ecgberht, and even his power did not keep them wholly in check. It must however have had some considerable effect, as it is only quite towards the end of his reign that we hear of them again. In his last years their incursions became frequent and formidable, and in one battle the Bretwalda himself was defeated by them. But he afterwards gained, over the united forces of the Northmen and the revolted Welsh, the battle of Hengestesdun in Cornwall, which may rank with Ellandun as the second great victory of his reign. Soon after this success, which barely checked the Danish invasions, but which completed the submission of the West-Welsh, King Ecgberht died, like his model Charles, with his own power undiminished, but possibly foreseeing what was to come when his sceptre should pass into weaker hands.

Three
Periods of
the Danish
invasions.

The Danish invasions of England, as I have already said,¹ fall naturally into three periods, each of which finds its parallel in the course of the English Conquest of Britain. As the Saxons and Angles plundered and

¹ See above, p. 12.

desolated long before they actually settled, so now their Northern kinsmen followed the same course. We first find a period in which the object of the invaders seems to be simple plunder. They land, they harry the country, they fight, if need be, to secure their booty, but, whether defeated or victorious, they equally return to their ships, and sail away with what they have gathered. This period includes the time from the first recorded invasion till the latter half of the ninth century. Next comes a time in which the object of the Northmen is clearly no longer mere plunder, but settlement. Just as the English had done before them, the Danes now come in much stronger bodies, and, instead of sailing away every winter with their plunder, they effect permanent settlements in a considerable part of the country. This took place in the second half of the ninth century. During the greater part of the tenth century, we read of few or no fresh invasions from Scandinavia itself,¹ but the West-Saxon Lords of Britain were engaged for more than fifty years in a constant struggle to reduce and retain in obedience the Danes who had already settled in the island. A short interval of peace, the glorious reign of Eadgar, follows; but, towards the end of the tenth century, the plundering invasions of the Danes begin again; but they soon assume altogether a new character. The North of Europe, hitherto divided among a crowd of petty princes, had now, like England, like the Empire, settled down into a more regular order of things. Three great Kingdoms, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, had arisen. With Sweden we had nothing directly to do; the conquests of that power were made to the East. With Norway also England proper had comparatively little to do, though the Northmen who ravaged and settled in Scotland and Ireland seem to have come

CHAP. II.
First Period, of simple plunder. 787-855.
Second Period, of settlement. 855-897.
Struggle of the West-Saxon Kings with the Danes settled in Britain. 902-954.
Third Period of Danish invasion. Period of political conquest. 980-1016.

¹ The Danes in Britain were however often assisted by their kinsmen—Norwegians perhaps rather than Danes—who had settled in Ireland.

CHAP. II. mainly from that part of Scandinavia. But the history of England for a long term of years is one record of constant struggles with the power of Denmark. This forms the third period. We have passed the time of mere plunder; we have passed the time of mere local settlement. We have now reached the time of political conquest, the time analogous to the conquests of the West-Saxon Kings from Cenwealh to Eadred. We now see
 994-1013. a King of all Denmark bent on achieving the conquest of all England. We at last see the foreign invader succeeding in his attempt, and reigning as King of the Eng-
 1013-1016. lish, with the formal, though no doubt the constrained, assent of the English nation. Of these three periods, the third, as furnishing some of the immediate causes of the Norman Conquest, I must deal with at greater detail at a later stage of this history. The two earlier periods, those of mere plunder and of mere settlement, come within the bounds of the present preliminary sketch.

Reign of
 Æthelwulf
 and his
 sons.
 836-901.

The reigns of the son and the grandsons of Ecgberht were almost wholly taken up by the struggle with the Northmen. In the reign of Æthelwulf the son of Ecgberht it is recorded that the heathen men wintered for
 855. the first time in the Isle of Sheppey. This marks the transition from the first to the second period of their invasions. Hitherto they had plundered and had gone away with their plunder; to spend the winter on English soil was the first step towards a permanent settlement. It
 864-866. was not however till about ten years from this time that the settlement actually began. Meanwhile the sceptre of the West-Saxons passed from one hand to another. It is remarkable that no English King of this or of the following century seems to have reached old age. After Æthelwulf, whose age is uncertain, only one or two of his descendants for several generations reached the age of fifty,

and the greater part of them were cut off while they were quite young. Four sons of Æthelwulf reigned in succession, and the reigns of the first three among them make up together only thirteen years. In the reign of the third of these princes, Æthelred the First, the second period of the invasions fairly begins. Five years were spent by the Northmen in ravaging and conquering the tributary Kingdoms. Northumberland, still disputed between rival Kings, fell an easy prey, and one or two puppet princes did not scruple to receive a tributary crown at the hands of the heathen invaders. They next entered Mercia, they seized Nottingham, and the West-Saxon King, hastening to the relief of his vassals, was unable to dislodge them from that stronghold. East-Anglia was completely conquered, and its King Eadmund died a martyr. At last the full storm of invasion burst upon Wessex itself. King Æthelred, the first of a long line of West-Saxon heroic Kings, supported by his greater brother Ælfred, met the invaders in battle after battle with varied success. He died, and Ælfred succeeded, in the thick of the struggle. In this year, the last of Æthelred and the first of Ælfred, nine pitched battles, besides smaller engagements, were fought with the heathens on West-Saxon ground. At last peace was made; the Northmen retreated to London, within the Mercian frontier; Wessex was for a moment delivered, but the supremacy won by Ecgberht was lost. For a few years Wessex was subjected to nothing more than temporary incursions, but Northumberland and part of Mercia were systematically occupied by the Northmen, and the land was divided among them. The last native King of the Mercians,¹ Burhred, the brother-in-law of Ælfred, had already been deposed by the Northmen, and had gone to Rome,

CHAP. II.

858-871.

Reign of Æthelred.
866-871.

Conquest of Northumberland.
867-869.

Invasion of Mercia.
868.

Conquest of East-Anglia.
870.

First invasion of Wessex.
871.

Reign of Ælfred.
871-901.

872.

876-877.

874.

¹ It is hardly worth while to reckon the puppet Ceolwulf, not of the royal house, set up for a moment by the Danes after the expulsion of Burhred.

CHAP. II.
Second in-
vasion of
Wessex.
878.

Peace of
Wedmore
and evacu-
ation of
Wessex.
878-880.

Reign of
Guthrum-
Æthelstan
in East-
Anglia.
880-890.

Character
and extent
of the
Danish
occupation.

where he ended his days. At last, the Northmen, now settled in a large part of the island, made a second attempt to add Wessex itself to their possessions. For a moment the land seemed conquered; Ælfred himself lay hid in the marshes of Somersetshire; men might well deem that the Empire of Ecgberht, and the Kingdom of Cerdic itself, had vanished for ever. But the strong heart of the most renowned of Englishmen, the saint, the scholar, the hero, and the lawgiver, carried his people safely through this most terrible of dangers. Within the same year the Dragon of Wessex was again victorious, and the Northmen were driven to conclude a peace which Englishmen, fifty years sooner, would have deemed the lowest depth of degradation, but which now might fairly be looked upon as honourable and even as triumphant. By the terms of the Peace of Wedmore the Northmen were to evacuate Wessex and the part of Mercia south-west of Watling-Street;¹ they, or at least their chiefs, were to submit to baptism, and they were to receive the whole land beyond Watling-Street as vassals of the West-Saxon King. Guthrum, the Danish King, was accordingly baptized by the name of Æthelstan; he took possession of his new dominions, and observed the peace with decent fidelity down to his death.

A large part of England thus received a colony of Danish inhabitants. They gave their name to their conquest, and England is for the future divided into Wessex, Mercia, and *Denalagu*, the region where the Danish law was in force. This Danish occupation was a real settlement of a new people in the land. There is no reason

¹ The exact boundary started from the Thames, along the Lea to its source, then right to Bedford and along the Ouse till it meets Watling-Street, then along Watling-Street to the Welsh border. See Ælfred and Guthrum's Peace, Thorpe's Laws and Institutes, i. 152. This frontier gives London to the English; but it seems that Ælfred did not obtain full possession of London till 886. See Earle's Parallel Chronicles, p. 310.

to think that any *extirpation* or expulsion of the native CHAP. II.
inhabitants took place, such as that which accompanied
the English Conquest. But the displacement of land-
owners and the general break-up of society must have
been far greater than anything that was afterwards ef-
fected by the Normans. How extensive the Danish occu-
pation was is best seen in the local nomenclature. The
West-Saxon counties retain to this day the names and the
boundaries of the principalities founded by the first suc-
cessors of Cerdic. In some of them there is no one domi-
nant town in a shire; several shires contain a town bearing
a cognate name,¹ but in one case only is the shire called
directly and solely after a town. That shire is the first
seat of the conquest, the shire which contained the capital.
No doubt it originally bore no name but that of *Westseax-*
narice; when it became needful to distinguish it from the
other West-Saxon principalities, it received the name of
Hamptonshire.² In short, the local divisions of Wessex
were not made but grew. Mercia, on the other hand,
has every appearance of having been artificially mapped
out. The shires, with two exceptions,³ are called after

Evidence
of local
nomencla-
ture.

Contrast
between
the West-
Saxon and
Mercian
shires.

¹ Berkshire and Devonshire contain no cognate towns at all. The shires of the Sumorsætas and Dorsætas contain cognate towns, Somerton and Dorchester. But these towns are merely cognate; the shires are not called after the towns, like Gloucestershire or Northamptonshire. The case of Wiltshire is intermediate. There was a tribe of Wilsætas, but the shire seems to be called immediately after the town, *Wiltunscir*, whence the *t* in the modern form Wiltshire. But still this case is different from Hampshire, which is simply named from the town, without any cognate tribe-name existing.

² It may be worth inquiring why the shire was called after the town of (South) Hampton, and not after the royal city of Winchester. Possibly some prerogative of the crown or some privilege of the citizens may have kept the capital distinct from the body of the shire.

³ Shropshire has a town which is merely cognate, Shrewsbury; Rutland alone has a distinct name of its own, and Rutland, strange to say, is, as a shire, later than Domesday. How Rutland became a distinct shire, while the adjoining and larger district of Holland did not, would be an interesting question for local antiquaries.

CHAP. II. towns, and, in most cases, the county groups itself round its capital, as round an acknowledged and convenient centre. The names of the old principalities vanish, and their boundaries are often disregarded. One principality is divided among several shires, and another shire is made up of several ancient principalities.¹ We can hardly doubt that the old divisions were wiped out in the Danish invasions, and that the country was divided again, either by the Danish conquerors or, more probably, by the English Kings after the reconquest.

Names of places in Northumberland and Mercia retaining the names of Danish lords.

Again, the names of the towns and villages throughout a large part of the ceded territory show the systematic way in which the land was divided among the Danish leaders. Through a large region, stretching from Warwickshire to Cumberland, but most conspicuously in Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, and Leicestershire, the Danish termination *by* marks the settlements of the invaders, and, in a vast number of cases, the name of the manor still retains the name of the Danish lord to whom it was assigned in the occupation of the ninth century. Names like Carlby, Haconby, Kettilby, Thorkillby, tell their own story.² In two cases at least the Danes gave new names

¹ Thus the principality of the Hwiccas has long formed two whole shires, Worcester and Gloucester, and part of another, Warwick. The Magonsætas seem to be divided between Herefordshire and Shropshire. Lincolnshire contains several principalities, Gainas, Lindisfaras, &c., but the traces of their original independence are not wholly lost even at the present day.

These and several other Mercian principalities we can identify, but such is by no means the case with all. In the very ancient list of Mercian divisions, printed by Mr. Kemble (*Saxons in England*, i. 81-85), many of the names have to be guessed at, and some are quite hopeless. It is not so with any portion of Wessex.

² Places seem to have been more commonly named directly after individuals in the course of the Danish Conquest than they had been by the earlier English occupiers. At least, among the names given during the English occupation, those which are formed from the proper name itself are less common than those which are formed from the patronymic ending in *-ing*. These last again raise the question, how far they are called after historical individuals and how far they are tribe-names called

to considerable towns. Streoneshalh and Northweorthig exchanged their names for the new ones of Whitby and Derby (Deoraby). This last town is one of considerable importance in the history of the Danish settlement. It formed, along with Lincoln, Leicester, Nottingham, and Stamford, a member of a sort of Confederation of Danish towns, which, under the name of the Five Boroughs, often plays a part in the events of the tenth and eleventh centuries.

CHAP. II.

Whitby
and Derby.The Five
Boroughs.

Ælfred, the unwilling author of these great changes, is the most perfect character in history. He is a singular instance of a prince, who has become a hero of romance, who, as such, has had countless imaginary exploits and imaginary institutions attributed to him, but to whose character romance has done no more than justice, and who appears in exactly the same light in history and in fable. No other man on record has ever so thoroughly united all the virtues both of the ruler and of the private man. In no other man on record were so many virtues disfigured by so little alloy.¹ A saint without superstition, a scholar with-

Character
of Ælfred.Singular
union of
virtues in
him.

after some mythical patriarch. This last view will be found discussed at length by Kemble, *Saxons in England*, i. 59 and Appendix A. Names like *Tooting*, *Bensington*, *Gillingham*, give the typical forms. On the other hand (see Kemble's note, p. 60), it should be remembered that this familiar form *ing*, being so familiar, has often swallowed up others; thus *Ethandún*, *Æbbandún*, *Huntandún*, forms of quite different origin, have been corrupted into *Edington*, *Abingdon*, *Huntingdon*. *Birmingham* again has been thought to be a corruption of *Bromicham*, but Mr. Kemble (i. 457) admits it as a genuine patronymic from the *Beormingas*. On the other hand, *Glastingabyrig*, a genuine patronymic, has been corrupted into *Glastonbury*, and a wrong derivation given to the name.

An exact parallel to the Danish system of nomenclature is supplied by a later and less known, though very remarkable, settlement of the same kind, the Flemish occupation of Pembrokeshire in the twelfth century. The villages in the Teutonic part of that county bear names exactly analogous to those of Lincolnshire, only ending in the English *ton* instead of the Danish *by*. Such are *Johnston*, *Williamston*, *Herbrandston*, and a crowd of others.

¹ The story which represents Ælfred as forsaken by his subjects on account of cruelties in the early part of his reign, and as being thus led to reformation, is part of the legend of Saint Neot, not of the history of Ælfred.

CHAP. II. out ostentation, a warrior all whose wars were fought in the defence of his country, a conqueror whose laurels were never stained by cruelty,¹ a prince never cast down by adversity, never lifted up to insolence in the day of triumph —there is no other name in history to compare with his.

Comparison with Saint Lewis ; Saint Lewis comes nearest to him in the union of a more than monastic piety with the highest civil, military, and domestic virtues. Both of them stand forth in honourable contrast to the abject superstition of some other royal saints, who were so selfishly engaged in the care of their own souls that they refused either to raise up heirs for their throne or to strike a blow on behalf of their people. But even in Saint Lewis we see a disposition to forsake an immediate sphere of duty for the sake of distant and unprofitable, however pious and glorious, undertakings. The true duties of the King of the French clearly lay in France and not in Egypt or at Tunis. No such charge lies at the door of the great King of the West-Saxons. With an inquiring spirit which took in the whole world, for purposes alike of scientific inquiry and of Christian benevolence, Ælfred never forgot that his first duty was to his own people. He forestalled our own age in sending expeditions to explore the Northern Ocean, and in sending alms to the distant churches of India; but he neither forsook his crown, like some of his predecessors, nor neglected its

with Washington ; duties, like some of his successors. The virtue of Ælfred, like the virtue of Washington, consisted in no marvellous displays of superhuman genius, but in the simple, straightforward discharge of the duty of the moment. But Washington, soldier, statesman, and patriot, like Ælfred, has no claim to Ælfred's further characters of saint and scholar.

with William the Silent ; William the Silent too has nothing to set against Ælfred's

¹ No one can blame Ælfred for hanging (see Chron. 897) the crews of some piratical Danish ships, who had broken their oaths to him over and over again. His general conduct towards his enemies displays a singular mildness.

literary merits, and in his career, glorious as it is, there is CHAP. II.
an element of intrigue and chicanery, utterly alien to the
noble simplicity of both Ælfred and Washington. The
same union of zeal for religion and learning with the
highest gifts of the warrior and the statesman is found, on
a wider field of action, in Charles the Great. But even
Charles cannot aspire to the pure glory of Ælfred. Amidst with Charles the Great ;
all the splendours of conquest and legislation, we cannot be
blind to an alloy of personal ambition, of personal vice, to
occasional unjust aggressions and occasional acts of cruelty.
Among our own later princes, the great Edward alone can with Edward the First.
bear for a moment the comparison with his glorious ancestor.
And, when tried by such a standard, even the great Ed-
ward fails. Even in him we do not see the same wonderful
union of gifts and virtues which so seldom meet together ;
we cannot acquit Edward of occasional acts of violence, of
occasional recklessness as to means ; we cannot attribute to
him the pure, simple, almost childlike, disinterestedness
which marks the character of Ælfred. The times indeed
were different ; Edward had to tread the path of righteous-
ness and honour in a time of far more tangled policy, and
amidst temptations, not harder indeed, but far more subtle.
The legislative merits of Edward are greater than those of Ælfred's
Ælfred ; but this is a difference in the times rather than position as a legis-
lator ;
in the men. The popular error which makes Ælfred the
personal author of all our institutions hardly needs a fresh
confutation. The popular legends attribute to him the in-
vention of Trial by Jury and of countless other portions of our
Law, the germs of which may be discerned ages before the
time of Ælfred, while their existing forms cannot be dis-
cerned till ages after him. Ælfred, like so many of our early
Kings, collected and codified the laws of his predecessors ;
but we have his own personal testimony¹ that he purposely

¹ "I then, Ælfred King, those [laws] together gathered, and had many
of them written which our foregangers held, those that me-liked. And

CHAP. II. abstained from any large amount of strictly new legislation. The legislation of Edward, on the other hand, in its boldness and originality, forms the most marked epoch in the history of our Law. It is perhaps, after all, in his literary aspect, that the distinctive beauty of Ælfred's character shines forth most clearly. As a rule, literary Kings have not been a class deserving of much honour. They have, for the most part, stepped out of their natural sphere only to display the least honourable characteristics of another calling. But it was not so with the Emperor Marcus; it was not so with our Ælfred. In Ælfred there is no sign of literary pedantry, ostentation, or jealousy; nothing is done for his own glory; he writes, just as he fights and legislates, with a single eye to the good of his people. He shows no signs of original genius; he is simply an editor and translator, working honestly for the improvement of the subjects whom he loved. This is really a purer fame, and one more in harmony with the other features of Ælfred's character, than the highest achievements of the poet, the historian, or the philosopher. I repeat then that Ælfred is the most perfect character in history. And he was specially happy in handing on a large share of his genius and his virtue to those who came after him. The West-Saxon Kings, for nearly a century, form one of the most brilliant royal lines on record. From Æthelred the Saint to Eadgar the Peaceful, the short and wretched reign of Eadwig is the only interruption to one continued

Happiness
of Ælfred
in his suc-
cessors.

many of them that me not liked I threw aside, with my Wise Men's thought, and on other wise bade to hold them. Forwhy I durst not risk of my own much in writ to set, forwhy it to me unknown was what of them would like those that after us were. But that which I met, either in Ine's days my kinsman, or in Offa's the King of the Mercians, or in Æthelberht's that erst of English kin baptism underwent, those that to me rightest seemed, those have I herein gathered and the others passed by. I then Ælfred, King of the West-Saxons, to all my Wise Men these showed, and they then quoth that to them it seemed good all to hold." Ælfred's Dooms, Thorpe's Laws and Institutes, i. 58-59. Schmid, p. 69.

display of valour under the guidance of wisdom. The CHAP. II.
greatness of the dynasty, obscured under the second
 Æthelred, flashes forth for a moment in the short and
 glorious career of the second Eadmund. It then becomes
 more permanently eclipsed under the rule of Dane, Nor-
 man, and Angevin, till it shines forth once more in the
 first of the new race whom we can claim as English at
 heart, and the greatest of the West-Saxons seems to rise
 again to life in the Greatest of the Plantagenets.¹

There can be little doubt that the Danish settlement in
 England, which seemed at first to be the utter destruction
 of the West-Saxon monarchy, tended in the end to the
 consolidation of England and of all Britain under the West-
 Saxon Kings. Looking at Ælfred as Bretwalda, a title
 which had passed away, or as King of the English, a title
 which he hardly ventured to assume, his loss was beyond
 expression. But, as local King of the West-Saxons, he
 undoubtedly gained. The Danes were nominally his vas-
 sals;² but their vassalage was so purely nominal that we
 may look on Ælfred as having lost all authority over East-
 Anglia, Northumberland, and the larger half of Mercia.
 But the remainder of Mercia was more closely united to

The Danish settlement tends to the consolidation of England under the West-Saxon Kings.

Closer union be-

¹ I borrow the title of an anonymous work, which forms an useful vindication of Edward the First against Welsh and Scottish calumnies, but which labours under the great defect of depreciating every one who in any way opposed him in England. Reverence for King Edward is in no way inconsistent with reverence for Simon of Montfort, Robert Winchelsea, and Roger Bigod. I ought perhaps to apologize for using the name "Plantagenet," which was first used as a surname by the House of York in the fifteenth century. But the usage is popular and often convenient. We cannot call our great Edward an Angevin.

² Guthrum of East-Anglia was a nominal vassal all along. But the Northumbrians, whether Danes or English, seem not to have made submission till 893, in the prospect of the last Danish invasion of this reign. Their King Guthred had just died. See the two statements in Simeon of Durham, X Scriptt. pp. 133 (M. H. B. 685), 151, and Palgrave, ii. cccxv. Cf. Chron. and Fl. Wig. 894.

CHAP. II. Wessex than it had ever been before. The realm was forsaken by its King; his dynasty was extinguished; and the over-lord no longer entrusted the dependency to a vassal King, but to an Ealdorman of his own appointment.¹ And, along with the recovered portion of Mercia, he also regained London, a town whose position was more like that of a German Free City than that of an integral portion of any Kingdom, but which we shall henceforth find to be one of the firmest strongholds of English freedom and one of the most efficient bulwarks of the realm.

Consolidation of Wessex. We may therefore look on the immediate West-Saxon territory as actually increased by the Danish invasion. Mercia was reduced to the form of a province; we hear no more of even dependent Kings in Kent and Sussex, but at most of Ealdormen of the King's appointment. All England south-west of Watling-Street was fast growing into a

Progress of the West-Saxon power aided by the Danish settlements. compact and homogeneous Kingdom. And the very fact of the foreign occupation of the rest of England paved the way for its easier incorporation with the one Kingdom which remained independent. The wars of Wessex with the Danes of Mercia and Northumberland were wars of quite another character from the old border strife between the English inhabitants of the several Kingdoms. They were, in the strictest sense, national wars, wars of religion and patriotism. The West-Saxon Kings were, in the eyes of all Englishmen in whatever part of the island, the champions of the national independence and the national faith. Their conquests brought with them deliverance from the Danish yoke, and we therefore find them everywhere wel-

¹ Æthelred was Ælfred's son-in-law. He seems to have been Ealdorman of the Hwiccas (most likely a descendant of the old under-Kings of that principality, and therefore very probably of West-Saxon blood), and to have had his authority extended by his father-in-law over all the English part of Mercia. It is possible however that, even before this grant of Ælfred's, he held some special position in Mercia, as in a charter of Burhred's (Cod. Dipl. ii. 99) he describes himself as "Æðelred, Deo adjuvante, Merciorum Dux."

comed as liberators by the subject English population. CHAP. II.
One or two attempts at a division of the Kingdom¹ show that the old local feelings had not fully died out; but their ill success shows no less clearly that such divisions no longer rested on any strong national basis. The successors of Ælfred were gradually enabled to win back the supremacy established by Ecgberht, and to enlarge it into an actual sovereignty over all England and an acknowledged supremacy over all Britain. The Kingdom so formed was at last overcome by a Danish conqueror, but it was overcome by a very different process from the settlement of this or that wandering pirate. It was the transfer of the crown of a consolidated English Kingdom to the head of the King of a now no less consolidated Kingdom of Denmark.

The reign of Ælfred contains two intervals of nearly 880-893. perfect peace. After the great deliverance of Wessex 897-901. there was no very serious warfare with the Danes till Later Danish Wars of Ælfred. quite towards the end of his life. Then came five years of a struggle almost as fearful as that of the early days of 893-897. his reign. But in the end Ælfred and England were again victorious. During the years of peace Ælfred had seen the need of forming a naval force to meet the Sea-Kings on their own element: It is wonderful how completely the old maritime spirit of the Angles and Saxons seems to have died out before his time. But both Ælfred and his successors diligently fostered the naval power of England, alike for war, for commerce, and for discovery. In short, Ælfred laid the foundations of that naval greatness which is the special pride of Englishmen. His fleet seems to have preserved Wessex itself from anything more than a few landings for plunder. But, for three years, Danish invaders, helped by the Danes settled in the

¹ Between Eadwig and Eadgar in 957, between Eadmund and Cnut in 1016, between Harold and Harthacnut in 1035. All these arrangements were short-lived, and they were probably not intended to be more than temporary compromises.

CHAP. II. country, marched to and fro through all Britain north of the Thames. But at last Ælfred succeeded in reducing them at least within the terms of the Peace of Wedmore, and he again enjoyed a few years of quiet before his death.

Death of Ælfred. 901. Ælfred's successor, Eadward the Elder, completed the work which Ecgberht had begun, by first extending the supremacy of Wessex over the whole Island of Britain.

Reign of Eadward the Elder. 901-925. Under his sons, Æthelstan, Eadmund, and Eadred, that supremacy was maintained and consolidated at the point of the sword. His grandson, Eadgar the Peaceful, enjoyed the fruit of their labours, and further strengthened their work by a reign of strong and orderly government, of constant readiness for warfare during a time, for those days, of unparalleled quiet. Thus, from Ecgberht to Eadgar, a hundred and seventy years built up the Kingdom of England, a Kingdom which, as coming events showed, could still be conquered, but which could no longer be permanently divided. The twenty-five years of Eadward are the turning-point; what he won his successors had only to preserve. It is only the unequalled glory of his father which has condemned this prince, one of the greatest rulers that England ever beheld, to a smaller degree of popular fame than he deserves. His whole reign bears out the panegyric passed on him by an ancient writer,¹ that he was fully his father's equal as a warrior and ruler, and was inferior to him only in those literary labours which peculiarly distinguish Ælfred among the princes of the age.² The work of Eadward was twofold; he

Reigns of his sons. 925-955. 800-975. Importance of the reign of Eadward.

¹ Florence of Worcester (901) after a splendid panegyric on Ælfred, continues, "Huic filius successit Eadwardus, cognomento Senior, litterarum cultu patre inferior, sed dignitate, potentiâ, pariter et gloriâ superior; nam, ut in sequentibus clarebit, multo latius quam pater fines regni sui dilatavit," &c. &c.

² The mere patronage of learning was common to Ælfred with many princes of that age, especially among the Carolingian sovereigns; it is his personal appearance as an author which is peculiar to himself.

enlarged the borders of his immediate Kingdom, and he brought the whole island under vassalage. His wars, and those of his three successors, were, it should be remembered, waged mainly against the Danes settled in Britain. These settlers were occasionally helped by their brethren from Denmark, and, far more commonly, by the Danes and the Northmen settled in Ireland; but, on the whole, foreign invasions do not form an important feature in the events of this half-century. The war began by the Northumbrian Danes taking the part of a defeated candidate for the West-Saxon crown,¹ who did not scruple to accept their alliance and to lead them to plunder and attempted conquest against his own countrymen. But Eadward, when thus put on the defensive, did something more than merely defend the Kingdom which he had received from his father. With the help of his sister Æthelflæd, the famous Lady of the Mercians,² he recovered from the Danish yoke the whole of Mercia, East-Anglia, and Essex, and the brother and sister secured their conquests by building fortresses in all directions. By the English population of all these districts Eadward was welcomed as a deliverer, and he found no difficulty in annexing the liberated provinces to his own Kingdom. After the death of Æthelflæd, who was her brother's close ally rather than his subject, the separate existence of Mercia came to an end. Eadward now became, what no West-Saxon King had been before him, immediate sovereign of all England south of the Humber. Having thus extended his immediate dominion beyond all precedent, he was able to extend his more general supremacy equally beyond anything

CHAP. II.

Alliance of Æthelwald with the Danes. 901-905.

Recovery of Mercia, &c. by Eadward and Æthelflæd. 905-912.

Annexation of Mercia. 912.

Eadward's Kingdom extended to the Humber.

¹ Ælfred was, according to custom, chosen in preference to the sons of his elder brother Æthelred, who were minors at the time of their father's death. On Ælfred's death one of these sons, Æthelwald, tried to obtain the crown, but the Witenagemót elected Eadward, the son of Ælfred.

² She was daughter of Ælfred and widow of Æthelred, Ealdorman of the Mercians, who died in 912.

CHAP. II. possessed by his predecessors. The princes of Wales, Northumberland, Strathclyde, and Scotland, all submitted to him by a voluntary act; "they chose him to father and to lord." No hostilities with either Strathclyde or Scotland are spoken of; the act of submission appears to have been made by the free consent of the rulers and people of those countries.¹ The motive to such an act is doubtless to be found in a dread of Eadward's power, combined with a sense of the necessity of his position as the general champion of Britain against the Danes. Scotland and Strathclyde had suffered as much from Scandinavian invasions as England had. To choose the West-Saxon King as their over-lord might involve some national humiliation, but it was better to receive the champion of Christendom as a suzerain than to be exposed without defence to the incursions of the heathen. Eadward thus obtained a far greater extent of dominion than had been held by Ecgberht himself. Ecgberht's immediate Kingdom stopped at the Thames, and his over-lordship reached only to the Forth. Eadward's immediate Kingdom reached to the Humber, and his over-lordship extended over the whole island. In receiving the submission of Wales and Northumberland he did but win back what his father had lost; but the submission of Scotland and Strathclyde was something wholly new. The Scots had recognized a precarious supremacy in the old Northumbrian Kings, perhaps a supremacy more precarious still in the great Frankish Emperor. But their submission to Wessex was wholly new; they had bowed to an over-lord at York, but those days were long past, and they had never before bowed to an over-lord at Winchester. This *commendation* of Scotland to the West-Saxon King is

All the
Princes of
Britain
submit
to him.
922-924.

Probable
causes of
their vo-
luntary
submission.

Novelty
and great-
ness of his
position.

¹ Chron. 924. "This year was Eadward King chosen to father and to lord of the Scots' King and of the Scots, and of Regnold King and of all Northumbrians, and eke of the Strathclyde Wealas' King and of all Strathclyde Wealas."

an event so important for the history of the next four hundred years, and it is an event which is often so completely misunderstood, that I must reserve some consideration of its exact bearing for my next Chapter. It is enough to say here that, from this time to the fourteenth century, the vassalage of Scotland was an essential part of the public law of the Isle of Britain. No doubt many attempts were made to cast off the dependent relation which had been voluntarily incurred; but when a King of the English had once been chosen "to father and to lord," his successors never willingly gave up the position which had thus been conferred upon them. Whenever the King of the English is strong enough, he always appears as the acknowledged feudal superior of the King of Scots. Kenneth acts the part of a faithful vassal to Eadgar. Eadward the Confessor, like his nobler namesakes before and after, acts as superior lord and, as such, transfers the tributary crown from an usurper to the lawful heir. When the Norman William had subdued England, he claimed and received the homage of Scotland as one of the undoubted rights of the crown which he had won. And nothing is clearer than that this homage was paid, not only for Cumberland or Lothian, but for the true Kingdom of the Celtic Picts and Scots. In the days of Eadward and Æthelstan, Lothian was still English or Danish, an integral part of the Kingdom of Northumberland, and the submission of Strathclyde was the separate act of another perfectly independent prince. The facts are undoubted; they are plain matters of history, which ought never to be looked at through the medium of provincial prejudice. The vassalage of Scotland to England is as certain as the earlier vassalage of Mercia to Wessex; but, for the last hundred and sixty years, the two facts have been of exactly the same practical importance.

CHAP. II.

Vassalage
of Scot-
land.

924-1328.

973.

1054.

1072.

Homage
paid for
Scotland
proper.

CHAP. II.

§ 5. *Imperial Sovereignty of the West-Saxon Kings of the English.* 924-975.

Eadward the Elder then was the first prince who could really claim to be King of the English and Lord of the Isle of Britain. His son Æthelstan added the finishing stroke to the work of his father, by first making North-

Reign of Æthelstan. 925-940.
926. humberland an integral portion of the realm. He thus became immediate King of all the Teutonic races in Britain, and superior Lord of all the Celtic principalities. In his second year, all the vassal princes, Welsh and Scottish, and a solitary Northumbrian chief who still retained some sort of dependent royalty,¹ renewed their homage. It is expressly mentioned that they renounced all idolatry ; many of the Danes no doubt still clave to their ancient worship. But Æthelstan had to fight to retain the empire which his father had won. Neither Danes, Welsh, nor Scots were very faithful vassals, but the power of the King of the English was too much for them all. Scotland was ravaged by land and sea ; Wales was constrained not only to homage but to tribute ; at last the rebellious Danes and their kinsmen from Ireland who came to their help, together with Constantine of Scotland and Owen of Strathclyde, who did not scruple to league themselves with the heathen barbarians, were all overthrown by Æthelstan and his brother Eadmund in the glorious fight of Brunanburh. That fight, looked on at the time as the hardest victory that Angles and Saxons had ever won, still lives in the earliest and noblest of those national lays with which the Chronicles, especially at this period,² relieve the direct course

Renewal of homage by the vassal Kings. 926.

933.

Battle of Brunanburh. 937.

¹ Ealdred the son of Ealdwulf, Lord of Bamborough. His father had been among the chiefs who did homage to Eadward in 924. We shall hear of his descendants in a later chapter.

² See Earle, p. xix. It is much to be lamented that the prose entries in the Chronicles for this important reign are so meagre. On the other hand,

of their prose narrative. The reign of this great prince is CHAP. II.
also remarkable for the brilliant position which England Foreign
now held with regard to foreign countries. Contrary to connexions
the usual custom of English Kings, Æthelstan, himself of Æthel-
childless, systematically formed family stan. connexions with the
chief powers of Europe. His numerous sisters were mar- [Marriage,
ried to a crowd of princes, ranging in dignity from Sihtric, 929.
the momentary King of the Northumbrians, to Otto, who Otto King,
placed his English wife on the throne of the East-Franks and 936.
who lived to be the restorer of the Roman Empire.¹ With Emperor,
some degree of exaggeration of the real facts, the court of 962.]
“glorious Æthelstan” is painted to us as the common re-
fuge of oppressed princes and as the school where the scions
of royalty learned the lessons which befitted Kings and
warriors. But, putting aside glories which are at least
partly fabulous, it is certain that the reign of Æthelstan
was a time of vigorous government and successful warfare
at home, and that in his days England had an unusual
amount of connexion with foreign countries and enjoyed
an unusual amount of consideration among them.² The
reigns of his two younger brothers, Eadmund the Mag- Reigns of
nificent and Eadred the Excellent,³ form a continuation of Eadmund
the same tale. The Northumbrian Danes were constantly and Ead-
revolting, constantly setting up Kings of their own, and red.
they were as constantly brought back to submission by 940-955.

William of Malmesbury has evidently worked out the life of Æthelstan with unusual care, seemingly from lost sources, and, amidst a great deal of fable, we recover some truth.

¹ Widukind (i. 37) calls Eadgyth sister of “Adalstanus” and daughter of “Ethmundus Rex Anglorum.” Our English names are constantly confounded by foreign writers, but it is curious to see Grimm’s Law accurately followed in translating their consonants into High-Dutch.

² I shall have to speak again of the foreign policy of Æthelstan in my Chapter on the Early History of Normandy.

³ Florence has some special epithet for each of the conquering Kings of this period—Eadward is “invictissimus,” Æthelstan “strenuus et gloriosus,” Eadmund “magnificus,” Eadred “egregius,” Eadgar “pacificus.”

- CHAP. II. the superior power of the Emperor¹ of Britain. At last, under Eadred, the rebellious land was finally subdued, the last phantom of Northumbrian royalty vanished, and the Kingdom beyond the Humber was for the future ruled by an Ealdorman or Earl of the King's appointment.
- Final submission of Northumberland. 954. Another success, hardly less valuable, was the final recovery of the Five Boroughs by Eadmund; a poetical entry in the Chronicles vividly paints the delight of their English inhabitants at their deliverance from the yoke of their heathen masters.² The relations of Scotland to the suzerain power seem, after the great defeat of Brunanburh, to have remained friendly for many years. Several Scottish Kings in succession had the wisdom to avoid following the suicidal policy of Constantine. Indeed the Scottish King Malcolm received a considerable extension of territory at the hands of Eadmund. The Kingdom of Strathclyde was conquered and abolished, and the greater part of it, Cumberland, Galloway, and other districts, were granted by Eadmund to Malcolm on the usual tenure of faithful service in war.³ This principality remained for a long time the apanage of the heirs-apparent of the Scottish crown, much as Kent had been to Wessex in the days of Ecgberht and Æthelwulf.
- Period of friendly relations with Scotland. 937-1000. That the Scots renewed their oaths on the accession of Eadred is no proof of hostile feelings on either side; it was merely an usual and necessary precaution at
- Grant of Cumberland to Malcolm. 945. 946.

¹ The *Imperial* character of the English royalty at this time will be spoken of more largely in the next Chapter.

² Leicester (Chron. 918), Stamford (922), and Nottingham (924) were all in possession of Eadward, who built fortresses at the latter two. Perhaps they had joined in the revolt of the Northumbrians in 941, but the words of the Chronicles may lead us to think that Eadward accepted the submission of the Confederation and built forts to keep the towns from rebellion, without interfering with their internal administration. A Danish civic aristocracy may therefore have existed down to the deliverance by Eadmund, holding the former English inhabitants in more or less of subjection.

³ See Palgrave, ii. p. cccxxvii. I shall enlarge on this grant in my next Chapter.

the beginning of a new reign, doubly necessary when CHAP. II.
Northumberland was in rebellion. The work begun by
Ecgberht was now finally accomplished. The King of
the West-Saxons had grown step by step into the ac-
knowledged King of the English and Emperor of the
Isle of Albion. A time now came when it seemed for

a moment that that work was at once to be undone in
the very hearth and home of the English Empire. For
a moment *Wessex* and *Mercia* were again divided. The
events of the next reign are recorded with a singular
amount of contradiction,¹ and the voice to which we
should have listened with undoubting confidence is all
but silent.² But, as far as can be made out, the two

young sons of *Eadmund* succeeded their uncle *Eadred*, Succession
the elder, *Eadwig*, reigning in *Wessex* as superior lord, of *Eadwig*
while the younger, *Eadgar*, reigned as under-King north in *Wessex*
of the *Thames*. From the stirring tale of an Empire and *Eadgar*
saved, consolidated, and defended by the unwearied efforts in *Mercia*.

of six wise and valiant monarchs,³ we turn to find our-
selves involved in the thick of an ecclesiastical controversy.
Dunstan, a name known to too many readers only as the

subject of one of the silliest of monastic legends, stands Dunstan.
forth as the leading man in both Church and State. As 925-988.

the minister of *Eadred* and of *Eadgar*, as the *Jehoiada* or Character
Seneca who watched over the still harmless childhood of of his
the second *Æthelred*, *Dunstan* is entitled to lasting and policy.
honourable renown. The ecclesiastical changes which were
promoted by him, perhaps still more by contemporary Pre-
lates like *Oda* of *Canterbury* and *Æthelwald* of *Winchester*,
are of a more doubtful character. To bring back the monks

¹ On the whole reign of *Eadwig*, see Mr. Allen's Essay attached to his
work on the Royal Prerogative.

² The entries in the Chronicles just at this time are singularly meagre.

³ *Eadred* had perhaps but little personal share in the military successes
of his reign ; but, if so, he deserves none the less credit for the choice of
efficient instruments to carry out a wise and vigorous policy.

- CHAP. II. to the observance of their rule, to raise the character of the secular clergy, often, no doubt, ignorant and worthless enough, were thoroughly praiseworthy undertakings. But the complete prohibition of clerical marriage, and the substitution of regulars for seculars in many of the cathedral and other chief churches of England, were certainly the works of a zeal which had far outrun discretion. And they had the effect of dividing the nation into two parties, and of producing an amount of mutual hostility which might well have led to even greater evils than it did lead to. The whole of the short reign of Eadwig is shrouded in mystery; but it is clear that he was the enemy of Dunstan, perhaps, to some extent, the enemy of the monks generally, and it is certain that he was the vigorous opponent of the policy which strove everywhere
956. to substitute monks for secular canons. The banishment of Dunstan, combined with an uncanonical marriage, seems to have roused popular feeling against a prince on whose real merits we are hardly in a position to pronounce a judgment. The Mercians chose their under-King Eadgar King in his own right, and in his separate dominions Dunstan was recalled and his policy vigorously carried out. The death of Eadwig soon followed, and the Kingdom of England and the Empire of all Britain were again reunited under the sceptre of Eadgar the Peaceful. His reign of seventeen years is a period of almost unbroken peace; we hear, almost unavoidably, of wars with the Welsh, of moment enough to be recorded by Welsh chroniclers, but which the English writers pass by.¹ Of Danish invasions we hear nothing for certain; but Westmoreland was once ravaged, seemingly by Eadgar's orders,² and we hear also
- Eadgar
chosen
King of
the Mer-
cians.
957.
Eadgar
succeeds
to the
whole
Kingdom.
958-975.
- 966.

¹ See Brut y Tywysogion, a. 965. With this seems to be connected the famous story of the tribute of wolves in William of Malmesbury, ii. 155.

An Irish campaign and victory of Eadgar (see the spurious charter of 964, Cod. Dipl. ii. 404) seem very apocryphal.

² Chron. 966.

more distinctly of a portion of Eadgar's own Kingdom, CHAP. II.
the Isle of Thanet, being treated in the like way at his 958.
bidding. These last facts point to some local revolts or
disturbances.¹ With these exceptions, weapons of war
seem to have hung useless throughout the English do- His peace-
ful and
vigorous
govern-
ment.
minions for a time which, short as it seems to us, was
in those days a wonderfully long interval of repose. But
if Eadgar's sword hung useless, it at least did not rust.
Eadgar, like Ælfred, knew how to guard his Empire,
and a fleet which yearly sailed round the whole island,
and which often carried the King in person, was a suf- His effec-
tive supre-
macy over
all Britain.
ficient safeguard of Britain against foreign foes. And
no West-Saxon Emperor ever made his supremacy so
fully felt by all the races of the island as the one West-
Saxon Emperor against whom no Scottish or Northum-
brian sword seems ever to have been drawn. With Ken-
neth of Scotland Eadgar was on good terms, and, according
to some statements, he increased his dominions by a most
important grant of territory.² To the Danes of Northum-
berland he was anxious to show that he had no mind to
deal with them as with a conquered people, and that he
remembered their services in helping to raise him to the
crown.³ In his legislation he takes care to assert their
perfect equality with the English and their right to be
governed only by laws of their own choosing.⁴ He de-
lighted in pomp and splendour, and there seems no
reason to doubt the historic truth of the tale of that
famous pageant in which the Emperor of Britain was 973.

¹ With regard to Thanet, the Chronicles witness to the fact; Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 748 A) guarantees its justice; it was done "quia jura regalia sperverant." Roger of Wendover (l. 414) knows all about it, and says it was because the men of Thanet plundered certain merchants of York.

² The alleged cession of Lothian is surrounded with so many difficulties that I reserve the question for an Appendix.

³ This is Dr. Lingard's probable conjecture. Hist. of England, i. 262.

⁴ Laws of Eadgar, in Thorpe's Laws and Institutes, i. 272, Schmid, p. 195.

CHAP. II. rowed on the Dee by eight vassal Kings.¹ But if the tale were only a symbolical expression, it would still be a most true and speaking symbol of the days of the greatest glory and prosperity of the West-Saxon Empire.

He encourages
intercourse
with
foreign
countries.

Under Eadgar too England held a high place in the estimation of foreign lands, and intercourse with them, commercial and otherwise, was sedulously promoted by an enlightened prince.² In ecclesiastical matters the policy of Dunstan was vigorously carried out. This fact may perhaps have won for Eadgar more than his due share of praise at the hands of monastic writers. But exaggeration itself cannot obscure the real glory of such a reign as his.³

Reign of
Eadward
the Martyr.
975-979.

But with Eadgar the glory of England sank. The reign of his elder son Eadward was short and troubled, and the young prince himself died by violence, most probably by the intrigues of an ambitious step-mother. His

Reign of
Æthelred
the Un-
ready.
979-1016.

brother Æthelred succeeded, a child, and one who would have been happy if he had always remained a child. In his time the Danish invasions began again, in a new form and with a more terrible effect than ever. In his time too begins that direct and intimate connexion between English and Norman history which shows that we are now approaching the days of the Norman Conquest, and that we have now reached the first links in the chain of its direct causes. The reign of Æthelred will therefore

¹ The best of all authorities, the Chronicles, bear witness to the meeting of Eadgar with six Kings at Chester, where they renewed their homage to him. Florence, the authority next in value, raises the number to eight, gives their names (Kenneth of Scotland, Malcolm of Cumberland, Maccus of the Isles, and five Welsh princes), and describes the ceremony on the Dee.

² In the ballad in the Chronicles (958) the only fault found with Eadgar is his fondness for foreigners, who are said to have corrupted the morals of the English in divers ways.

³ The scandalous stories told of Eadgar's private life, are, with one exception, that of the abduction of the nun Wulfthryth, mere romances, without a shadow of authority.

claim a somewhat fuller treatment than that of a preliminary sketch. CHAP. II.

We have thus traced out the steps by which the West-Saxon Kings, from Ecgberht onwards, founded that Kingdom of England which one conquest was to hand over to the King of the Danes and another conquest to the Duke of the Normans, but which was never again to be permanently divided, and which each conquest only served to unite more firmly. We have seen also how, along with the consolidation of their Teutonic Kingdom, the same West-Saxon princes obtained a more extended and more precarious Empire over their Celtic neighbours. The later fate of its various portions has been widely different. In Cumberland no sign is left, and in Cornwall not many, that the dominion of the English King was once that of an external over-lord and not that of an immediate sovereign. On Wales the English dominion has been pressed closer and closer, till all political and civil distinctions between Wales and England have been wiped out, though the ancient language, and with it a distinct provincial feeling, still remains. Scotland, after various fluctuations, at last won complete independence of the English over-lord, and was finally united with England on equal terms as an independent Kingdom. Strange to say, the little realm of Man is the only part of the Empire of Eadgar which is not now thoroughly fused into the general mass of the United Kingdom.¹ But different as has been the later fate of the various portions of the dominions of Eadgar, his Teu-

Recapitulation.

Union of
Wales ;
[1293.
1356.
1830.]

of Scot-
land ;
[1328.
1707.]

Man still
distinct.

¹ As long as Man retained its separate Kings or even Lords, it was strictly in the same position in which it was in the days of Eadgar. Even now, as retaining its own Legislature and not being represented in the Imperial Parliament, it is a dependency of the British Crown, like the Channel Islands, not an integral part of the United Kingdom, like England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland.

CHAP. II. **tonic Kingdom and his Celtic Empire both passed nearly untouched into the hands of the Norman Conqueror. In another preliminary Chapter I must attempt a general picture of the condition and constitution of the Kingdom and Empire thus transferred. I must then give some account of the history of Normandy up to the point which I have now reached in the history of England. I shall then be prepared to go on with the more detailed history of the Norman Conquest itself and of the causes which immediately led to it, beginning with the reign of Æthelred the Second.**

CHAPTER III.

THE CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND IN THE TENTH AND ELEVENTH CENTURIES.¹

I HAVE no intention whatever of entering, in the present Chapter, into any examination of the minute details of our early English legal antiquities, still less into the controversies to which many points relating to them have given rise. I wish merely to give such a sketch of the political condition of England, at the time when

¹ I cannot, in this Chapter, lay claim to the same originality which I hope I may fairly claim in the narrative parts of this history. The early political and legal antiquities of England have been treated of by so many eminent writers that there is really little more to be done than to test their different views by the standards of inherent probability and of documentary evidence, and to decide which has the best claim to adoption. Among many other works two stand out conspicuously, Sir Francis Palgrave's *History of the English Commonwealth* and Mr. Kemble's *Saxons in England*. My readers will easily see that I have learned much from both, but that I cannot call myself an unreserved follower of either. Another most important work is Dr. Reinhold Schmid's *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen* (2nd ed. Leipzig, 1858). The most valuable part is the Antiquarian Glossary, the principal articles of which swell into essays on the most important subjects suggested by the Old-English Laws, supported by the most lavish array of references for every detail. On the whole, I think I shall be commonly found maintaining the same constitutional views as Mr. Kemble, except on the point of the *Imperial* character of the Old-English monarchy, an aspect of it which Mr. Kemble has rather unaccountably slurred over. This point, one which so closely connects itself with other studies of mine, is perhaps the one which I have thought out more thoroughly for myself than any other. Sir Francis Palgrave, with his characteristic union of research, daring, and ingenuity, was the first to call attention to the subject; but I must confess that many of his views on the matter seem to me not a little exaggerated.

CHAP. III. England and Normandy began to influence each other's

The Old-
English
constitu-
tion sur-
vived the
Norman
Conquest.

affairs, as may make the narrative of their mutual inter-
course intelligible. What the constitution was under
Eadgar, that it remained under William. This assertion
must be taken with all the practical drawbacks which are
involved in the forcible transfer of the Crown to a foreign
dynasty, and in the division of the greater part of the
lands of the Kingdom among the followers of the foreign
King. But the constitution remained the same; the laws,
with a few changes in detail, remained the same; the
language of public documents remained the same. The
powers which were vested in King William and his Witan
remained constitutionally the same as those which had
been vested in King Eadgar and his Witan a hundred
years before. The change in the social condition of the
country, the change in the spirit of the national and local
administration, the change in the relation of the Kingdom
to foreign lands, were changes as great as words can ex-
press. The practical effect of these changes was a vast
increase of the royal power, and the introduction of wholly
new relations between the King and every class of his
subjects. But formal constitutional change there was
none. I cannot too often repeat, for the saying is the
very summing up of the whole history, that the Norman
Conquest was not the wiping out of the constitution, the
laws, the language, the national life of Englishmen. The
changes which distinguish the thirteenth and fourteenth
centuries from the tenth and eleventh are not owing to
any one cause. Many of them are merely the natural
results of altered circumstances. Many of them are the
work of lawgivers legislating for a new state of things,
and, in not a few cases, confirming or restoring ancient
English institutions under foreign names. Many of them
are due to the ingenuity of lawyers whose minds were full
of theories of law wholly alien to the principles of ancient

The
changes
immedi-
ately fol-
lowing on
the Con-
quest prac-
tical, not
formal.

Various
causes of
the ulti-
mate re-
sults of the
Conquest.

English jurisprudence. All these changes were in some sort the ultimate results of the Conquest. Some of them were actually caused by that event; others were hastened by it. But of very few indeed was it the direct and immediate cause. The English Kingship gradually changed from a Kingship of the old Teutonic type into a Kingship of the later mediæval type. The change began before the Norman Conquest; it was hastened by the Norman Conquest; but it was not completed till long after the Norman Conquest. Such a change was not, and could not be, the work of one man or of one generation. But so far as it can be said to be the work of one man, so far as there was one man who put the finishing stroke to the work, one man who gathered up detached and incoherent elements into one consistent system, that man was not William of Normandy, but Henry of Anjou.

CHAP. III.
Change in the monarchy from the old Teutonic to the later mediæval type.

The change gradual, but brought to perfection by Henry the Second.

§ 1. *Origin of the Old-English Kingship.*

What then was the nature, and what was the origin, of that Kingship, which the election—the constrained and unwilling election, but still the election—of the Witan of all England did, on Midwinter-day, eight hundred years back, entrust to William, Duke of the Normans—from that day forward William, King of the English? That election transferred to him the same internal power over his own Kingdom, the same external power over the dependent Kingdoms, which had been held by Eadgar and Æthelred, and which an earlier forced election of a foreign conqueror had transferred to the hands of Cnut the Dane. We have already traced the course of the events by which those powers, internal and external, grew up. Two Saxon chiefs, *Ealdormen* or *Heretogan*, formed a settlement on the south coast of Britain. After some years of successful warfare, they assumed the kingly title over their

Question proposed, Origin and nature of the ancient English Kingship.

Recapitulation of the growth of Wessex.

495.

519.

CHAP. III. own tribe.¹ One of their successors incorporated some of
 823-828. the other Teutonic Kingdoms with his own realm, and
 obtained an external suzerainty over all the other Teutons
 in the island and over a portion of the Celts. A series of
 878-954. his successors, after long struggles, incorporated all the
 Teutonic states into one Kingdom, and obtained an ex-
 ternal Empire over all the Celtic states. The Ealdorman
 of the Gewissas thus gradually grew into the King of the
 West-Saxons, the King of the Saxons,² the King of the
 English, the Emperor of all Britain. The external aspect
 of this process, the dates of its several stages, I have
 already marked. I must now dwell a little longer on the
 real origin and nature of the various powers implied in
 those different descriptions of the ruler. Each stage marks
 an advance in the extent of territorial dominion; each
 stage marks also an advance in the amount of political
 authority enjoyed by the sovereign.

Modern
 political
 controver-
 sies alien
 to the
 question.

In following up these researches into our earliest political
 antiquities it is absolutely necessary to cast away all recol-
 lections of modern political controversies. Time was when
 the whole fabric of our liberties was held to depend on the
 exact nature of the entry made by William the Bastard.
 Time was when supporters and opponents of Parliamentary
 Reform thought to strengthen their several positions by
 opposite theories as to the constitution of the Witenagemot.
 To this day a popular orator will sometimes think that he
 adds point to a declamation by bringing in Saxon Ælfred as
 the author of Trial by Jury, perhaps of every other privilege
 which other lands are held either not to possess or to have

¹ The exact import of this change will be presently explained.

² "Rex Saxonum" is a title often used by Ælfred. It is clear that he
 was more than King of the West-Saxons, less than King of the English.
 His dominions included the vast majority of the Saxon districts of Eng-
 land, and very little of the purely Anglian. "Rex Saxonum" therefore
 was his most appropriate description.

borrowed from ourselves. Every notion of this kind must be CHAP. III.

wholly cast away, if we would fairly and impartially learn

what the institutions of our Teutonic forefathers really

were. The lover of freedom certainly need not shrink

from the inquiry. He will not indeed find that the

finished systems of the nineteenth or of the seventeenth

century were brought over ready made in the keels of

Hengest and Horsa. He will not even find that they

appeared in their perfect form in the Imperial Witen-

gemot of Eadgar the Peaceful. He will not find the

legislative authority vested in a Representative Assembly

to which every shire and borough sends the men of its

choice. He will not find a King the freedom of whose

will is at once hampered and protected by the tutelage

of Ministers responsible to that Representative Assembly.

He will not find tribunals in which issues of law are deter-

mined by Judges independent alike of King and people,

while issues of fact are determined by the people them-

selves in the form of jurors taken at haphazard from

among them. Not one of these things will he find in

the finished shape in which he is familiar with them.

But he will find the first principles from which all of

them were derived; he will find the germs out of which

all of them were developed. He will not find the relations

of King, Lords, and Commons accurately balanced in the

first Teutonic settlement on the shores of Kent. But he

will find the rudiments of all three in days which were

ancient in the days of Hengest. Let him go as far back

as history or tradition throws any light on the institutions

of our race, and he will find the germs alike of the

monarchic, the aristocratic, and the democratic branches

of our constitution. When positive evidence within our

own land fails us, we must go for illustration and ex-

planation, not to the facts, the theories, the controversies,

of modern politics, but to the kindred institutions of the

but the

germs of

later in-

stitutions

may be

traced

from the

beginning.

The pre-

sent shape

of our

political

institu-

tions not

to be

looked for

in early

times,

Necessity

of compari-

son with

other

Teutonic

nations.

CHAP. III. kindred nations on the Continent. Our Parliament is the true and lawful representative, by true and lawful succession, of the ancient Meeting of the Wise; but, if we would search out the origin and constitution of that Meeting of the Wise, we must go, not to the parliamentary traditions of the last six hundred years, but to the *Marzfeld* of the Frankish Kings, to the *Landesgemeinden* of Uri and Unterwalden, to those yet earlier Assemblies which still rise before us in full life in the pages of the first inquirer into the habits and institutions of our race. From the *Germania* of Tacitus onwards, through the Barbaric Codes, through the Capitularies of the Frankish Kings and Emperors, through the records of our own insular legislation from the Doms of Æthelberht to the so-called Laws of Henry the First, we have a series of witnesses, showing what were the general principles of Teutonic Law, and what were the particular forms which it assumed in particular times and places. In truth we may go beyond the records of our own immediate race. The early history of the Teuton is constantly illustrated by the early history of his Aryan kinsmen, and the living picture of the old Achaians of Homer brings vividly before us many an institution of our own forefathers and many an incident of their early history.

Records of
Teutonic
Law from
Tacitus
onwards.

Analogies
with the
Homeric
Achaians.

Origin of
Teutonic
Kingship.

The sketch which has been given in the last Chapter has shown that the Imperial lordship of all Britain, as held by Æthelstan and his successors, and even the supremacy of Wessex over the other English Kingdoms, as established by Ecgberht, were institutions of comparatively late growth. But it must not be thought that even the full-grown local Kingship, such as we find it held by Æthelberht in Kent and by Eádwine in Northumberland, was a thing which had been from the beginning. In the days of Tacitus some of the Teutonic tribes had

Kings and others had not;¹ in the time of Cæsar it would seem that Kingship was the exception and not the rule.² Kingship The chieftains of the first settlers in our own island seem not universal; government to have borne no higher title than *Ealdorman* or *Heretoga*.³ by Ealdor- These two names seem to express two different aspects of men or Heretogan. the same office. The same person is Ealdorman as a civil ruler and *Heretoga* as a military chieftain.⁴ The former Force and name survives in our language, but with sadly diminished history of dignity; the title which once expressed a rank which, the names. among worldly dignities, was inferior to Kingship alone, has taken refuge with a class of municipal magistrates, extending themselves downwards to the pettiest boroughs. The other name, always much more rarely in use, has dropped altogether out of our tongue, while, among the continental Teutons, the cognate word *Herzog* expresses a dignity whose distinction from modern Kingship must be drawn by the courtier and not by the politician.⁵ The

¹ Tacitus (Germ. 25, 44) seems to distinguish the tribes "quæ regnantur" from others. So Arminius was suspected of aiming at royalty. (Ann. ii. 88.) On this whole subject of the origin and growth of Kingship, see the Authorities and Illustrations to Allen on the Royal Prerogative.

² Bell. Gall. vi. 23. "In pace, nullus est communis magistratus; sed principes regionum atque pagorum inter suos jus dicunt." This seems to imply a government by Ealdormen as distinguished from one by Kings. "Pagus" is the *Gau* or *Scir* (Shire).

³ Chron. 449 (of the Jutes): "Heora heretogan wæron twegen gebroðra, Hengest and Horsa." Here *heretogan* translates the *Duces* of Bæda, i. 15. Chron. A. 495 (of the West-Saxons): "Her comen twegen ealdormen on Brytene, Cerdic and Cynric his sūnu."

⁴ Kemble, Saxons in England, ii. 126. I do not however understand Mr. Kemble's meaning when he says that "the word *Heretoga* is nowhere found in the Saxon Chronicle, and, to the best of his remembrance, but once in the Charters." Besides the passage above quoted, it is found in the Chronicles under the years, 794 (of Danish pirates), 993 (of English commanders), 1003 (in a proverb), 1121 (of a Duke of Lotharingia). I have not looked through all the Charters for the purpose, but it is found in three successive ones of Bishop Oswald. Cod. Dipl. iii. 259, 260, 261.

⁵ We have just seen *Heretoga* used in English to translate the High-Dutch *Herzog*. The Dukes and Counts of France commonly appear in the Chronicles as *Eorlas*. Ælfred uses *Heretoga* to translate the Latin *Consul*,

CHAP. III. name of Ealdorman is one of a large class;¹ among a primitive people age implies command and command implies age; hence in a somewhat later stage of language, the *elders* are simply the rulers, and the *eldest* are the highest in rank, without any thought of the number of years which they may really have lived.² It is not perfectly clear in what the authority or dignity of the King exceeded that of the Ealdorman, but it is clear that the title of King did carry with it an advance in both respects. Most probably even the smallest Kingdom was formed by the union of the districts of several Ealdormen.³ It is probable too that the King was distinguished by some religious sanction of heathen times, analogous to the ecclesiastical consecration which in later times the Church bestowed upon Kings, but not upon Princes of inferior rank. It is certain that Kingship required descent from the Gods; it may be that no such divine origin was needed by the mere Ealdorman.⁴ At all events, we find the change from Ealdorman to Kings taking place in more than one Kingdom of Teutonic Britain, as well as in many of the kindred races on the Continent.⁵ We have already

Import of
the change
from Eal-
dormen to
Kings.

Instances
in Britain
and else-
where.

just as, in return, French Counts and English *Ealdormen* are by some writers constantly spoken of as *Consules*.

¹ See Kemble, ii. 128. He compares the use of *Senatus*, γέρον, πρεσβύ-
τερος, and the feudal sense of *Senior*, *Seigneur*. Πρέσβυς in the sense of
Ambassador may be added to the list. The Latin *Patres* too expresses the
same general idea.

² The "yldestan þegnas" and similar phrases simply mean highest in
rank. See Kemble, u. s., and, for a longer list, Heywood's *Ranks of the
People*, p. 53. Cf. Schmid's Glossary, under *Eald*, *Ealdorman*, &c.

³ This seems implied in the descriptions given by Cæsar and Tacitus.
One general Assembly transacts the affairs of several districts, each of
which has its local chief.

⁴ All our English Kings claimed descent from Woden. The well-known
words of Tacitus (Germ. 7), "Reges ex nobilitate; Duces ex virtute sumunt,"
seem to show that birth was at least of less importance in an Ealdorman
than in a King.

⁵ See the description given by Bæda (v. 10) of the Old-Saxons at the
end of the seventh century. They had no King, but "Satraps," doubtless

seen that the Kingdoms of Northumberland and East-
 Anglia were formed by the union of several smaller states
 whose rulers did not assume the royal title.¹ In Wessex
 the account is still more remarkable. Cerdic and Cynric
 entered the land with the title of Ealdorman; they did
 not assume Kingship till after the arrival of fresh rein-
 forcements, and till a decisive victory over the Welsh
 had confirmed their position in the country.² During
 the whole period commonly called that of the Heptarchy
 the whole land was full of petty princes, some of whom
 undoubtedly bore the title of King, though others may
 have reigned simply as Ealdormen. According to one
 account, the West-Saxons, as late as the seventh century,
 were for ten years without any common sovereign, the
 Ealdormen or Under-Kings reigning independently.³ This
 falling back on an older system has its parallels; there
 is one noted case in Lombard history,⁴ but it would be

CHAP. III.

The West-
 Saxon
 Ealdormen
 become
 Kings.
 495-519.

Alleged
 return of
 Wessex to
 Ealdor-
 manship.
 673-685.

Ealdormen; in war-time one Satrap was chosen as a common commander, but his superiority ended with the conclusion of peace. So, according to Paul Warnefrid (Gest. Langob. i. 14, ap. Muratori, i. 413), the Lombards were at first governed by Dukes, but afterwards "nolentes jam ultra esse sub ducibus, Reges sibi ad ceterarum instar gentium statuerunt." There is no reason to doubt the fact, though it is placed in a mythical age, and though Paul the Deacon is evidently thinking of Saul and the Hebrews. And of course the changes from Judges and "Dukes" to Kings among the Hebrews and Edomites are instances of the same law.

¹ See above, pp. 25, 26.

² This is the meaning which I put on the passages of the Chronicles. In 495 Cerdic and Cynric land as Ealdormen; in 519 we find nearly the same words applied to them as to Ida, "Her Cerdic and Cynric West-seaxena rice onfengon." The word *rice* I take to mark the change from Ealdormanship to Kingship. Meanwhile, in 514, is placed the reinforcement under Stuf and Wihtgar.

³ Bæda, iv. 12. "Cumque mortuus esset Coinvalch . . . acceperunt subreguli regnum gentis, et divisum inter se tenuerunt annis circiter decem. . . . Devictis atque amotis subregulis, Cædualla suscepit imperium." The Chronicles however give an uninterrupted succession of Kings during this time. In 672 Cenwealh dies; his widow Sexburh succeeds (a most rare case of a female reign). Then follow Æscwine in 674, Centwine in 676, Ceadwalla in 685. See Allen, u. s.

⁴ Paul. Warn ii. 32, ap. Mur. i. 436. "Post cujus mortem [Cleph]

CHAP. III. specially remarkable in a Kingdom which had, from the beginning, greater unity than most of its fellows. But, at least from the time of Ecgberht onwards, there is a marked distinction between the King and the Ealdorman. The King is a sovereign, the Ealdorman is only a magistrate. The King may be hampered in the exercise of his power by the rights of his people or by the joint action of the great men of his realm; he may be chosen by his Witan and he may be liable to be deposed by them; still he is a sovereign, inasmuch as he does not rule by delegation from any personal superior. He may even be, by original grant or more probably by *commendation*, dependent on some more powerful King; but even such dependence does not degrade him from his sovereign rank. His relation to his over-lord binds him to certain external services, but in his internal government he remains perfectly independent, with his power limited only by the laws of his own realm. But the Ealdorman has become distinctly a subject. He may hold the fullest royal power within his own district; he may be the descendant of former Ealdormen and even of former Kings; he may reasonably hope to hand on his dignity to his own children; still he is not a sovereign, but a subject. The King is supreme; the Ealdorman is simply sent by him. He is a Viceroy appointed by the King and his Witan; he is liable to be removed by them, and he is responsible to them for the exercise of his authority. When the Kingdom of Mercia was broken up, Ælfred entrusted the government of the part which fell to his share to his son-in-law Æthelred as Ealdorman.¹ Æthelred was a

Distinction between King and Ealdorman from Ecgberht onwards.

Distinction between the Ealdorman and the dependent King.

Position of Ealdorman Æthelred in Mercia. 880-912.

Langobardi per annos decem Regem non habentes sub Ducibus fuerunt. Unusquisque Ducum [there were thirty of them] suam civitatem obtinebat." (It is worth noticing that a considerable body of Saxons is said to have taken a part in the Lombard invasion of Italy. Paul. ii. 6.) See Allen, 165. Compare the twelve Kings of Egypt in Herod. ii.

¹ See above, p. 56.

man of royal descent; he exercised full royal power in CHAP. III.
 Mercia; but he exercised it simply as a Governor-General
 or Lord-Lieutenant, the representative of a sovereign
 whose higher authority he studiously recognizes in his
 charters.¹ So, when Northumberland was finally incorpo- Case of
 rated with England under Eadred, Kingship was abo- Northum-
 lished, and the government was intrusted to a magistrate berland.
 with the title of Ealdorman or its Danish equivalent Eorl.² 954.
 By the exactly contrary process, Princes of the Empire, Contrary
 Dukes—that is, Ealdormen or Heretogan—and not only process
 Dukes, but Counts, Margraves, Landgraves, all of them in the
 originally mere magistrates under the Emperor-King, Empire.
 have gradually grown into sovereign princes, and have
 at last, in several cases, ventured to assume the kingly
 title.³

The mere title of King seems to be comparatively recent Title of
 among the Teutonic nations. It does not occur in the King
 earliest Teutonic monument, the Gothic Gospels; but in (Cynning);
 our own language it seems to be as old as the English its origin.

¹ Cod. Dipl. ii. 108: "Ego Æðelred, gratiâ Domini largifluâ concedente,
 Dux et Patricius gentis Merciorum, cum licentiâ et impositione manûs
 Ælfredi Regis, una cum testimonio et consensu seniorum ejusdem gentis,
 episcoporum vel principum, pro redemptione animarum nostrarum, et pro
 sospitate nec non et stabilitate regni Merciorum." (Mercia is still a King-
 dom, like Ireland before 1800.) So again, ii. 110: "Ic Æðelræd Ealdorman
 inbryrdendre Godes gefe gewelegod and gewlenced mid sume dæle Mercna
 rices mid Ælfredes cyninges leafe and gewitnesse, and mid ealra
 Myrcna witena godcundra hada and woroldcundra." (This document
 comes nearer than is usual in English to the inflated style of the Latin
 charters.) In one later charter of 901 (ii. 136) Æthelred and his wife seem
 to assume a more royal style: "Æðered Æð[el]fædque o]pitulante gratiâ
 Dei gratiâ monarchiam Merceorum tenentes," &c. Perhaps Æthelred and
 the Lady felt themselves more nearly on an equality with their brother
 than with their father. But see ii. 148, where the supremacy of Eadward
 is distinctly recognized.

² See above, p. 64.

³ The modern German princes represent nothing but modern dynastic and
 diplomatic arrangements; otherwise one might compare this process with
 the return to Ealdormanship in Wessex and Lombardy.

CHAP. III. settlements in Britain. Most of the questions which have arisen as to the etymology of the word only show how modern a thing scientific etymology is.¹ *Cyning*, by contraction *King*, is evidently closely connected with the word *Cyn* or *Kin*. It may be its direct patronymic; it may come immediately from a cognate adjective;² but the connexion of the two words is obvious, and is shown by a whole crowd of cognates.³ And the connexion is not without an important meaning. The King is the representative of the race, the embodiment of its national being, the child of his people, and not their father. A King, in the old Teutonic sense, is not the King of a country, but the King of a nation. Such titles as King of England or King of France⁴ are comparatively modern, and the idea which they express is equally so.⁵ The Teutonic King

The
Teutonic
Kingship
national,
not terri-
torial.

¹ Sir Francis Palgrave's attempt (ii. ccxli.) to derive the word from a Celtic root *Cen*, (*head*), to say nothing of other objections, could not account for the use of the word among the Teutonic nations on the Continent. Still more ludicrous is the notion of the King being the *cunning* or *cunning* man, an idea which could have occurred only to a mind on which all Teutonic philology was thrown away.

The modern High-Dutch *König* is an odd corruption; but the elder form is *Chuninc*. The word in English has never had a feminine; *Queen* is simply *Cwen*, woman, wife, the same as the Greek *γυνή*.

² See Allen, p. 176. Kemble, i. 153.

³ *Cynebarn*, *cynecyn*, *cynedome*, *cynehelm*, *cynehlaforð*, (used in the *Chronicles*, a. 1014, as equivalent to *gecynde hlaforð*), *cynelice*, *cymerice*, *cynestol*. (I copy from Mr. Earle's Glossarial Index.) In all these words *cyn* has the meaning of *royal*.

⁴ "Rex Franciæ" actually occurs as early as the tenth century. Flodoard, A. 924. But this is not a formal title; it is merely the annalist's vague way of describing or pointing at a prince who had as yet no formal title. If one Rudolf is "Rex Franciæ," in the very same year another Rudolf is "Cisalpinæ Rex Galliæ," which certainly never was the formal title of any man. The truth is that, throughout the ninth and tenth centuries, the various Frankish Kings had no formal title beyond the vague "Rex Francorum," common to all of them. The Chroniclers had therefore to describe each King as they might, and very oddly they did describe them sometimes.

⁵ *Rex Francorum Christianissimus* is the style down to the end of the line of Valois. *Franciæ et Navarra Rex* came in with Henry of Bourbon.

is not the lord of the soil, but the leader of the people. CHAP. III.

The idea of the King of a country would have been hardly intelligible to our forefathers. Every King is King of a people. He is King of Goths, Franks, Saxons, wherever Goths, Franks, Saxons, may happen to settle. The Goths and their Kings moved from the Danube to the Tiber, and from the Tiber to the Tagus; but Alaric and Ataulf were equally Kings of the Goths, in whatever quarter of the world the Goths might be. So, in our own island, the King is King of the West-Saxons, Mercians, or Northum-

brians. Indeed the countries themselves, as distinguished from their inhabitants, can hardly be said to have any names. We talk, for convenience' sake, of Wessex, Mercia, and so forth; but the correct description is the Kingdom of the West-Saxons, the Kingdom of the Mercians. No names for the English Kingdoms as distinguished from the people.

(*Westseaxnarice, Myrcnarice.*)¹ So, when the West-Saxon King had swallowed up all his brethren, he became, not King of England,² but King of the English. It is only

When the ancient title was revived in 1791, and again in 1830, many people thought it a strange innovation.

Among earlier Kingdoms also, we find the national and not the territorial style. It is always *Λακεδαιμονίων, Μακεδόνων*, even *Περσῶν* and *Μήδων βασιλεὺς*. So *Romanorum Imperator*, *Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς*, is the style of both Empires, down to the last days of each.

¹ The name of the people alone is often used for the country, like Franken and Hessen in Germany, like Lokroi, Leontinoi, and similar names, in Greek geography. So in the Chronicles, under 774 we have "gefuhton Myrce and Cantwara," where *Myrce* is clearly the people; but in 796, "hine læddon on Myrce," we must take *Myrce* for the country.

² It would seem that Cnut, and Cnut alone before the Norman Conquest, did call himself "King of England." In the Preface to his Laws (Thorpe, i. 358. Schmid, 250) he is called "Cnut cyninge, ealles Engla-landes cyninge, and Dena cyninge and Norðrigena cyninge." In the letter from Rome in Florence (1031) he calls himself "Rex totius Angliæ et Denemarcie et Norreganorum et partis Suanorum." In a doubtful charter (Cod. Dipl. iv. 50) he is "Rex totius Angliæ regni atque Danorum;" "Cing ealles Englalandes and ealra Dena." In two most doubtful charters (Cod. Dipl. iv. 25, 41) he is "Kining of Ænglelande," and "Rex totius Angliæ et Danmarchiæ et Norwagiæ et magnæ partis Swavorum." In other charters he is either "Rex Anglorum" (as Florence

CHAP. III.

The King
is King
of the
English
(not of
England),
but Em-
peror of
Britain.

Name of
Englaland
hardly
known.

in their Imperial character, in their character, not as chiefs of a nation, but as lords over all the dwellers within the Isle of Britain, that our Kings ever assume the territorial description. The King is *Rex, Imperator, Basileus, totius Britanniae* or *totius Albionis*; but he is *Rex Anglorum*, not *Rex Angliae*. Indeed England itself has hardly a geographical name. *Englaland* is a late form, scarcely found before the Danish Conquest. The common name for the land is the name of the people, *Angel-cyn*.¹

Growth of
the kingly
power by
mere ex-
tension of
territory.

The King's power and dignity gradually grew. They grew by the mere extension of his dominions. The larger a prince's territory becomes, the greater is the distance at which he finds himself from the mass of his subjects. He

calls him when speaking in his own person) or else he assumes the Imperial style.

It has been suggested that Cnut took up the territorial style as being a conqueror of the land, not a native monarch of the people. But the above instances show that, though he fluctuates between the two forms, he makes no consistent distinction between his hereditary and his acquired Kingdoms. Moreover Cnut, like William, was formally elected King, and he was even less likely than William to assume any title which would be offensive to his English subjects. This makes one inclined to look a little further. In the most authentic documents, *Anglia, Englaland*, does not occur without a qualification; the words are "*totius Angliæ*," "*ealles Englalandes*." Is this so distinctly and unmistakeably territorial as the later forms, "*Rex Angliæ*," "*King of England*"? The *totius*, the *ealles*, strikes me as making a difference. It may show that what is meant is, not "*King of England*" in the later sense, but "*King over the whole land of the English*," as distinguished from Cnut's narrower and earlier dominion when the Kingdom was divided between him and Eadmund. But anyhow Cnut stands alone before the Norman Conquest in the use of this style. After the Conquest "*Rex Angliæ*" begins to creep in, but at first very rarely. William himself is all but invariably "*Rex Anglorum*." Richard is the first King who is systematically "*Rex Angliæ*" in his charters, and even he is "*Rex Anglorum*" on his seal. And during his reign his mother stuck to the old style "*Regina Anglorum*." The final innovation of "*Rex Angliæ*" on the seal is due to King John. See Allen, p. 51.

¹ *Englaland*, in its different forms, does not appear in the Chronicles till the Danish Conquest under the year 1014. *Angel-cyn*, which in 597 clearly means the people, must, in 975 and 986, be taken for the country. So still more plainly in 1002. In many places it may be taken either way.

becomes more and more clothed with a sort of mysterious dignity; he comes more and more to be looked upon as something different from ordinary men, even from ordinary civil magistrates and military leaders. The prince of a small territory is known to all his people; he is, according to the character of his government, a personal friend or a personal enemy; if worthy himself and the descendant of worthy ancestors, he may command a strong feeling of clannish loyalty, but he cannot hedge himself in with the fence of any special divinity. A King who reigns over all Wessex is, in the nature of things, more of a King¹ than one who reigns only over the Isle of Wight, and a King who reigns over all England is more of a King than one who reigns only over Wessex. Through this cause only, every fresh addition of territory added fresh power and dignity to the Kings of the House of Cerdic in their progress from the Ealdormanship of a corner of Hampshire to the Imperial Crown of the Isle of Britain. But this cause was by no means the only one. The growth of the royal power was greatly helped by another cause, fully to understand which we must go back to the very earliest accounts which we have of the political institutions of the Teutonic race. From the very beginning of our history two opposing elements may be discerned, one of which in the end gained the complete mastery over the other. The one is the original self-governing Teutonic community; the other is the King or other Lord with his personal following.²

Two elements in Teutonic political life, the Free Community and the *Comitatus*.

¹ II. ix. 160. καὶ μοι ὑποστήτω, ὅσσον βασιλεύτερός εἰμι.

² In tracing the origin and progress of the *Comitatus* or *Thegnhood* I find no essential difference between the views of the two greatest writers on the subject, Sir Francis Palgrave and Mr. Kemble. It is only when we draw near to more purely political questions that the two theories diverge in any marked way.

CHAP. III.

§ 2. *The early Teutonic Constitution and its Decay.*

The Teu-
tonic Free
Commu-
nity ; its
monarchic,
aristo-
cratic, and
democratic
elements.

Analogy
of the
Homeric
Achaïans,

and the
historical
Mace-
donians.

I said above that, in the very earliest glimpses of Teutonic political life, we find the monarchic, the aristocratic, and the democratic elements already clearly marked. There are leaders, with or without the royal title ; there are men of noble birth, whose noble birth, in whatever the original nobility may have consisted, entitles them to pre-eminence in every way ; but beyond these there is a free and armed people, in whom it is clear that the ultimate sovereignty resides. Small matters are decided by the chiefs alone, great matters are submitted by the chiefs to the assembled nation.¹ Such a system is far more than Teutonic ; it is a common Aryan possession ; it is the constitution of the Homeric Achaïans on earth and of the Homeric Gods on Olympos. Zeus or Agamemnôn is King ; he has his inner Council of great Gods or of great leaders ; he has his General Assembly of all the divine race or of all the warriors who fought before Ilios.² The constitution of legendary Hellas remained the constitution of historical Macedonia ; the Assembly of the Macedonian nation—in war-time of the Macedonian army—remained, even under Philip and Alexander, the constitutional authority to decide on questions of succession to the throne, and the tribunal in

¹ Tac. Germ. ii. "De minoribus rebus principes consultant ; de majoribus omnes ; ita tamen ut ea quoque, quorum pates plebem arbitrium est, apud principes pertractentur." This is exactly the Greek *βουλή* and *δῆμος*.

² For the Assembly of the Achaïans, see Il. ii. 51 ; for that of the Gods, see Il. xx. 4. Compare on the Homeric Assemblies, Grote, Hist. of Greece, ii. 91, and Gladstone, Homer and the Homeric Age, iii. 114. It certainly strikes me that Mr. Gladstone has realized far more thoroughly than Mr. Grote the position of the simple freeman of the Homeric age, which Mr. Grote is inclined to undervalue. So most people are inclined to undervalue the position of our *Ceorlas*. See Hallam, Supplementary Notes, p. 206 et seqq.

which was vested the power of adjudging a Macedonian The system a natural one in a small state.
~~to determine~~ ^{th.} In short, the division of powers between the Council, and the General Assembly,
~~the~~ ^{the} leader, the Council, and the General Assembly, the government of a small state
~~is the~~ ^{the} form into which the government of a small state almost necessarily throws itself. The
~~or it~~ ^{the} dependent tribe almost necessarily throws itself. The
~~hereditary~~ ^{hereditary} prince and the aristocratic Council may be ex-
~~changed~~ ^{changed} for an elective chief magistrate and an elective
~~Council~~ ^{Council}; but the division of powers remains the same,
~~and~~ ^{and}, in either case, the ultimate sovereignty remains in
~~the~~ ^{the} General Assembly, in the Agoré, the Ekklésia, the
~~Comitia~~ ^{Comitia}, the Marzfeld, the Landesgemeinde. Of the nature
~~and functions~~ ^{and functions} of such an Assembly I shall have presently
~~to speak~~ ^{to speak}, when I trace out the origin and nature of the
~~Old-English~~ ^{Old-English} Witenagemot. My present point is the dis-
~~tinction~~ ^{tinction} of orders in the state. Tacitus sets before us a Distinction of Eorl and Ceorl.
~~marked distinction~~ ^{marked distinction} between the noble and the common free-
~~man, that is, in Old-English phrase, between the Eorl and~~ ^{man, that is, in Old-English phrase, between the Eorl and}
~~the Ceorl. The modern English forms of these words have~~ ^{the Ceorl. The modern English forms of these words have}
~~completely changed their meaning. The word Earl, after~~ ^{completely changed their meaning. The word Earl, after}
~~several fluctuations, has settled down as the title of one~~ ^{several fluctuations, has settled down as the title of one}
~~rank in the Peerage; the word Churl has come to denote~~ ^{rank in the Peerage; the word Churl has come to denote}
~~a certain form of moral obliquity, irrespective of the rank~~ ^{a certain form of moral obliquity, irrespective of the rank}
~~of the person who is guilty of the offence. But, in the~~ ^{of the person who is guilty of the offence. But, in the}
~~primary meaning of the words, Eorl and Ceorl—words~~ ^{primary meaning of the words, Eorl and Ceorl—words}
~~whose happy jingle causes them to be constantly opposed~~ ^{whose happy jingle causes them to be constantly opposed}
~~to each other—form an exhaustive division of the free~~ ^{to each other—form an exhaustive division of the free}
~~members of the state. The distinction in modern lan-~~ ^{members of the state. The distinction in modern lan-}
~~guage is most nearly expressed by the words Gentle and~~ ^{guage is most nearly expressed by the words Gentle and}
~~Simple. The Ceorl is the simple freeman, the mere unit~~ ^{Simple. The Ceorl is the simple freeman, the mere unit}
~~in the army or in the assembly, whom no distinction of~~ ^{in the army or in the assembly, whom no distinction of}
~~birth or office marks out from his fellows. It must not~~ ^{birth or office marks out from his fellows. It must not}
~~be forgotten that, among the ancient English, as among~~ ^{be forgotten that, among the ancient English, as among}
~~all other Teutonic nations, the system of slavery was in~~ ^{all other Teutonic nations, the system of slavery was in}

¹ On the amount of freedom among the Macedonians, see Edinburgh Review, April 1857, p. 327, and the passages there quoted.

CHAP. III.

full force. The Ceorl therefore, like the ancient Greek citizen, though he might be looked down upon by an aristocratic class, was actually a privileged person as compared with a large number of human beings in his own city or district.¹ The origin of the distinction it is in vain to search after; the difference of the Eorl and the Ceorl is a primary fact from which we start; it is as old as the earliest notices of Teutonic institutions, and the only attempt at its explanation is to be found in an ingenious mythical story in a Northern Saga.² Nor is it very easy to see in what the privileges of the Eorl consisted, or how far they were secured by definite laws. Perhaps we may gain some idea by looking at those communities which have preserved the old Teutonic system of government with the least alteration, the democratic Cantons of Switzerland.³ There, amid the purest democracy in the world, where every adult freeman has a direct and equal vote in the Assembly, we still find that certain families, enjoying no legal privileges above their fellows, were held in a kind of hereditary reverence, and that members of those families were preferred above all others to the highest offices in the state. Such were the houses of Reding in Schwyz, of Tschudi in Glarus, of the Barons of Attinghausen in Uri. The office of Landammann, the chief magistracy of the commonwealth, conferred by the

Analogy
of the de-
mocratic
Cantons of
Switzer-
land.

Traditional
predomi-
nance of
certain
families.

¹ See History of Federal Government, i. 37-38.

² The story is in the *Ríg's-mal*, and will be found in the English translation of Mallet's Northern Antiquities, p. 365. Jarl, Karl, and Thræll, all born on one day through the power of the God Heimdall, are the respective ancestors of the three classes of men, Eorls, Ceorls, and Slaves. Karl, among other sons, has Husbandman, Holder, and Smith.

³ Of the history and constitution of these commonwealths I trust to treat more at large in the second volume of my History of Federal Government. I will now only say that, though the amount of independence enjoyed by the ancient Cantons has often been greatly exaggerated, there is evidence enough to show that, in some districts at least, the old Teutonic system can be traced back uninterruptedly as far as we have any records at all, so that we may fairly presume an unbroken succession from the Germans of Tacitus.

yearly vote of the **Landesgemeinde**, commonly fell to the lot of members of these great houses; the same man was constantly re-elected year after year, and, when he died, his son was often elected in his place. Or, without going far from home, we may see what is essentially the same thing in the position of old county families, holding no legal advantages above their fellows, but which still enjoy an hereditary respect and preference at their hands. The Eorl and the Ceorl in fact answer pretty much to the Esquire and the Yeoman;¹ the modern artificial Peerage is something quite different, and we shall presently perhaps see its beginnings.

Comparison of old county families among ourselves.

The primitive Teutonic community is thus set before us as one of Eorls and Ceorls, headed by a King, Ealdorman, or other leader, temporary or permanent, elective or hereditary. Such a community occupies its own territory, its Mark;² which territory consists of land of two kinds. There is the common land, either applied to the general use of the community or else held by individuals on such terms as the community, in its character of landowner, may think fit to allow. There are also the particular possessions of individuals, portions assigned to them by common consent, which are the absolute property of their owners, held of no superior, but simply subject to such burthens as the community, in its political character, may think good to impose on its members. All this again is in no way

The territory or Mark of the Community.

¹ This comparison may surprise some who have been accustomed to look on the Ceorls as a very degraded class. There can be no doubt that among the Ceorls there were men of very different positions, that the general tendency of their position was to degenerate, and that, by the time of the Norman Conquest, some classes of them had advanced a good way on the road to serfdom. But this was not the condition of the whole order even then, still less was it the original conception of *Ceorldom*. The original Ceorl is a citizen and a soldier; he is, or may be, a landowner; on the one hand he is free, on the other he is not noble. See the remarks in Hallam's Supplementary Notes already referred to.

² See Mr. Kemble's Chapter on "The Mark" in the first volume of *The Saxons in England*.

CHAP. III. *Folkland* or *Ager Publicus*. distinctively Teutonic; it is the story of the ancient commonwealths of Greece and Italy over again. The *folkland*¹ of England and the *ager publicus* of Rome are the same thing. The English and the Latin names translate one another; they both express the land which still belongs to the community as a body, and of which individuals cannot be more than the occupiers.² The whole history of the Roman Agrarian Laws, so long misunderstood, turns simply on the regulation of this common land of the state. In the time of Cæsar it would seem that the whole territory of a Teutonic community was *folkland*; individuals could obtain no right in it beyond that of a yearly tenancy.³ But the custom of allotting portions of the common stock in absolute property gradually advanced. A conquest like that of Britain would be highly favourable to the growth of the practice. When a band of Teutonic warriors took possession of a district and slew or dispossessed its former inhabitants, we cannot doubt that, besides the stock reserved as common property, each man who had borne his share in the labours and dangers of the conquest would claim his reward in the absolute ownership of some portion of the conquered territory. The Eorlas, who would doubtless act as the leaders of the expedition, may well have received a larger share; but we may be sure that no freeman bearing arms went altogether without some share of the spoil. Such an allotment in absolute property, held of no superior, subject to nothing but the laws of the state, is called in different Teutonic dialects *eðel*, *odal*, or *alod*. It is an estate, great or small, which the owner does not hold

Allodial
property,
eðel or
odal.

¹ To Mr. Allen (Royal Prerogative, p. 129) belongs the honour of having first explained what *folkland* and *bookland* really were.

² In Latin *possessores*, the word so fertile in confusions as to the Agrarian Laws.

³ Cæsar, Bell. Gall. vi. 22. Cf. Tac. Germ. 26, but from c. 16 it would seem that in his time the institution of the *eðel* had already begun.

either of the King or of any other Lord, but in regard to which he knows no superior but God and the Law. CHAP. III.

These communities of freemen, among whom some had a pre-eminence in rank, and doubtless in wealth, but among whom every freeman was a member of the state, form one of the elements of Teutonic life as we see it in its very earliest pictures. But those same pictures set no less strongly before us another element, which grew up alongside of the primitive democracy, and which was destined in the long run to supplant it more or less completely in nearly every Teutonic country. The ancient Teutonic community can now be seen in its purity only in a few of the smallest Swiss Cantons, and, in several even of these,¹ the ancient freedom had to be reconquered and was not uninterruptedly retained. Everywhere else it is as much as we can do to trace out some faint footsteps of the ancient system, such as we see in common lands, in some forms of communal institutions, in petty and half obsolete local tribunals. The thing itself has given way to the other institution described by Tacitus, the *Comitatus*, the personal following of the chiefs. Every Teutonic King or other leader was surrounded by a band of chosen warriors, personally attached to him of their own free choice.² The chief and his followers were bound together by the strongest ties of mutual trust, and a lack of faithfulness on either side was reckoned among the most shameful of crimes. The followers served their chief in peace and in war; they fought for him to the death, and rescued or avenged his life with their own. In re-

The primitive democracy gives way to the institution of

the *Comitatus*, the personal following of the Chiefs.

¹ In Glarus and Appenzell altogether so, and even in Uri to some extent.

² On the *Comitatus* see the classical passage of Tacitus, Germ. 13, 14 (cf. 25), and for the working out of the whole in detail, see Mr. Kemble's two Chapters, "The Noble by Service" in the first volume, and "The King's Court and Household" in the second.

CHAP. III. turn, they shared whatever gifts or honours the chief could distribute among them; and, in our tongue at least, it was his character of dispenser of gifts which gave the chief his official title. He was the *Hlaford*, the *Loaf-giver*,¹ a name which, through a series of softenings and contractions, and with a complete forgetfulness of its primitive meaning, has settled down into the modern form of *Lord*. His followers were originally his *Gesiðas* or *Companions*, a word which Ælfred uses to express the Latin *Comes*, but which must have dropped out of use very early, as it is not found in the Chronicles. The *Gesið* or *Companion* became the *þegn* (*Thegn*, *Thane*) or *Servant*, a change of name which might seem to imply a lowering of the nature of the relation, and which perhaps in a manner did so. As Kings advanced in power and dominion, it was not unnatural that a certain element of servility should find its way into the relation of the *Comitatus*, of which there is no trace in the primitive shape of that institution. The service of the King or other great Lord conferred dignity even on the freeman. This is a notion altogether foreign to the ideas of republican Greece and Rome; but here again the primitive Teuton is but the reproduction of the primitive Achaian. The Homeric Kings have their *comitatus*, their *Gesiðas* or *ἑταῖροι*, their *þegnas* or *θεράποντες*, free, noble, the cherished companions of their Lords, but who do for those Lords, without any loss of their own dignity, services which, in later Greece, would have been exacted of none but slaves. Eteôneus, Automedôn,² Merionês, the divine Pa-

Nature
of the
relation.

The *Hlaf-*
ord and
his *Gesi-*
ðas;

Origin of
þegnas
(*Thanes*).

Homeric
analogies.

¹ Looked at philologically, this word *Hlaford* is most puzzling, and the feminine *Hlæfdige* (Lady) is more puzzling still. But it is enough for my purpose, if a connexion with *Hláf* in any shape be admitted, whatever may be thought of the last syllable.

² Hom. Od. iv. 22:

ὁ δὲ προμολῶν ἴδετο κρείων Ἑτεωνεύς,
ὄτρηρὸς θεράπων Μενελάου κυδαλίμοιο,
βῆ δ' ἱμεν ἀγγελίων διὰ δώματα ποιμένι λαῶν.

troklos himself, all appear in this relation; all are connected by this voluntary personal tie to a chieftain of higher rank. They are the very counterparts of Lilla, the faithful Thegn of Eadwine,¹ and of those true companions who fought to the death for Cynewulf and Cyneheard.² The republican Greek knew no Lord but the Law;³ he was a member of a civil community; as a good citizen, he obeyed the magistrates whom the choice of the community invested with a limited and temporary power. But personal dependence on another human being seemed to him the distinguishing mark of the slave as opposed to the citizen. The republican Roman shared the same feeling; the early Cæsars were served by slaves or freedmen;⁴ it was only as the Empire gradually grew into an avowed monarchy, and gradually assumed somewhat of the pomp of eastern kingship, that service about the person of the Emperor began to be looked upon as honourable in a man of free Roman birth. In the Teuton, as in the Homeric Achaian, the feeling of the civil community, though far from unknown, was less strong, and the tie of personal dependence was not felt to imply degradation. Indeed the Teuton carried the principle of

CHAP. III.
Contrast
with the
republican
Greeks and
Romans.

So Il. xxiv. 473:

Ἴταροι δ' ἀπάνευθε καθεύατο· τῷ δὲ δῦ' οἶον
ἦρως Αὐτομέδων τε, καὶ Ἀλκιμος ὄζος Ἀργεος,
ποίπνυον παρέοντε.

Eteóneus is *κρείων*, Automedôn is *ἦρως*, yet they are the *begnas* of Menelaos and Achilleus respectively.

¹ Bæda, ii. 9. "Lilla minister (begn) Regis amicitissimus." He saves his *hlaford's* life at the cost of his own.

² See this most remarkable story in the Chronicles, 755. Florence, 784.

³ Herod. vii. 104. ἔπεστι γὰρ σφί δεσπότης νόμος, τὸν υποδειμαίνουσι πολλῶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ οἱ σοὶ σέ.

⁴ Of this feeling, and the gradual change as the Empire advanced, I have spoken in the National Review, No. 31 (January 1863), p. 170. See the passages quoted in the note, Tac. Hist. i. 58, and Spartianus (in Hist. Aug. Scriptt.) Hadrian, 22.

CHAP. III. personal service far further than the Roman ever did. Purely menial services, when rendered to persons of exalted rank, were held, not only not to degrade the free-man, but to confer positive honour on all who were, if only by one degree, less exalted. None of the old Cæsars ever held such lordly state as those among their successors who, while retaining hardly a vestige of real Imperial power, still saw Kings and Sovereign Dukes performing services about their person and household which, in the days of Augustus, would have been deemed a degradation to the meanest Roman citizen. So, among ourselves, offices about the person and household of the Lord became high and honourable. The King's *dish-thegn*, his *bower-thegn*, his *horse-thegn* or *staller*, all became great dignitaries of the Kingdom, high in rank and influence,¹ as some of them, among all the changes in our institutions, still remain. There thus arose a new kind of nobility, nobility by service, the nobility which gradually attached to the *Thegns* or Servants of Kings and Ealdor-

Developement of the principle in the later Empire and in modern Kingdoms.

The *Thegns* supplant the old *Eorls*.

men; and this nobility gradually supplanted the elder nobility of immemorial descent.² Men pressed into the service of powerful leaders, till such service became the necessary badge of anything like distinguished rank. The *Thegn*, whose name might sound at first hearing like the exact opposite of the ancient *Eorl*, gradually took his

¹ Mr. Kemble however (ii. 112) remarks that the greatest men of the Kingdom, men like Godwine, Leofric, and Siward, seem never to have held such offices. So, in our own day, a man who had any chance of becoming First Lord of the Treasury would not stoop to become Lord Chamberlain or Master of the Horse.

² The supplanting of an older by a newer form of nobility has several parallels in history. The distinction between *patricii* and *nobiles* at Rome has some analogies to that between *Eorlas* and *þegnas* in England. The plebeian could not become patrician; he could become noble; and this plebeian nobility, derived from the possession of curule magistracies, answered to our Thegnhood in being a nobility of office, though in this case of office conferred by the people and not by a King or other Lord.

place. The word *Thegn* became equivalent to *noble* or *gentle*. The King's Thegns formed the highest rank of gentry; the Thegns of Ealdormen and Bishops formed a lower class. Again to use a modern parallel, the ancient *Eorl* answers to the gentleman of ancient family, looked at simply as the descendant of certain forefathers and the owner of certain property; the *Thegn* answers to the gentleman, whether with or without such ancestry, looked at as holding, by royal or other commission, his place in the local magistracy and the local military force.

The *Comitatus*—the *Thegnhood*, as we may call it—thus grew and developed, and became the central institution of the state. With every advance of the kingly power—and every accession of territory, every free or constrained amalgamation of one district with another, implied an advance of the kingly power—the dignity of the King's Thegns rose along with the dignity of their Hlaford. In one way the change was a liberalizing one. The Ceorl could not become an Eorl, simply because a man cannot change his forefathers; but several ways were open to him of becoming a Thegn.¹ And now Thegn's rank had become practically equivalent to Eorl's rank. But, though individual Ceorls might thus rise, there can be no doubt that the growth of the Thegnhood was, on

Effects of
the growth
of the
Thegn-
hood.

Favour-
able to
individual
Ceorls, but
depressing
to the class.

¹ On the promotion of Ceorls to higher rank, the following passages are explicit: "We witan þæt þurh Godes gyfe þræl wærð tō þegene and ceorl wearð tō eorle, sangere tō sacerde and bōcere tō biscope," (Be griðe and be munde. Wilkins, 112. Thorpe, i. 334. Schmid, 386). "And gif ceorl geþeah þæt he hæfðe fullice fíf hīða agenes landes, cirican and kycenan, bell-hūs and burh-geat-setl and *sunder-note on cynges healle*, þonne wæs he þononforð þegen-rihtes weorðe." (Thorpe, i. 190. Schmid, 388. "Be leōd-ge þineðum and lage.") The whole of this last document bears on the subject. Compare also the table of Wergilds (Schmid, 396), ii. § 9. On the first extract I may remark that the jingle of beginnings and endings has carried the lawgiver a little too far. In strictness the Ceorl could not become an Eorl (in the older sense of the word); but a Ceorl, or even a Thrall when once manumitted, might become a Thegn, and, once a Thegn, he might conceivably become an Eorl in the later sense.

CHAP. III. the whole, depressing to the Ceorls, the simple freemen, as a class. The idea of the simple *landman*—I must borrow a word from our continental brethren, as the word *citizen* brings in quite other ideas—the undistinguished, but still free and, in a sense, equal member of a free community, gradually died out. The institution of the *comitatus*, which in its origin was essentially voluntary, was, as it were, pressed upon all men, till at last it became a principle that no man should be without his Lord. The freeman might choose his Lord, he might determine to whom, in technical phrase, he should *commend*¹ himself; but a Lord he must have, a Lord to act at once as his protector and as his surety, at once to watch over him and to give a guaranty for his good behaviour. The lordless man became a kind of outlaw, while, in the older state of things, the whole community

Commendation.
Every man
must have
a Lord.

¹ This practice of *commendation*, or choosing a lord, must be carefully borne in mind, not only on account of its vast importance in the social condition of England and other Teutonic countries, but because we shall presently see the same process applied to international transactions on a great scale.

I cannot forbear transcribing the passage in which Mr. Kemble (Saxons in England, i. 183) sums up the general results of the growth of the Thegnhood. "As the royal power steadily advanced by his assistance, and the old, national nobility of birth, as well as the old, landed freeman sunk into a lower rank, the *gesith* found himself rising in power and consideration proportioned to that of his chief; the offices which had passed from the election of the freemen to the gift of the crown, were now conferred upon him, and the ealdorman, duke, *geréfa*, judge, and even the bishop, were at length selected from the ranks of the *comitatus*. Finally, the nobles by birth themselves became absorbed in the ever-widening whirlpool; day by day the freemen, deprived of their old national defences, wringing with difficulty a precarious subsistence from incessant labour, sullenly yielded to a yoke which they could not shake off, and commended themselves (such was the phrase) to the protection of a lord; till a complete change having thus been operated in the opinions of men, and consequently in every relation of society, a new order of things was consummated, in which the honours and security of service became more anxiously desired than a needy and unsafe freedom; and the *alods* being finally surrendered, to be taken back as *beneficia*, under mediate lords, the foundations of the royal, feudal system were securely laid on every side."

would be lordless, except those who might, of their own will, have entered the *Comitatus* of some chief. I postpone any minute inquiry into the testimony of Domesday Book¹ till I reach the date of that precious document; but I may say here that its contents leave little doubt that the condition of the *Ceorls* had greatly changed for the worse in the later times as we approach the Norman Conquest. Some classes among them seem to have been fast approaching to the condition of villainage or even to that of serfdom. This change is not peculiar to England; but it is the peculiar glory of England that the bondage of the mass of its people began later, and certainly ended sooner, than in any other western country where such bondage existed. The German peasantry gradually sank into a lower state of serfdom than ours, and they remained in it much longer. The free peasantry of Russia did not sink into serfdom till villainage was nearly forgotten in England; but their deliverance from the yoke has been reserved for our own times.

Depression of the *Ceorls* towards the period of the Conquest.

This sketch of the growth of the Thegnhood and its effects at once suggests the question, Did the Feudal System exist in England before the Norman Conquest? It might perhaps be allowable to answer this question by another, Did the Feudal System ever exist anywhere? In England, before the Norman Conquest, the Feudal System most certainly did not exist. There was no systematic Feudalism, but all the elements of Feudalism were there in full vigour. Feudalism consists of two main elements; the feudal relation implies the union of two other relations. There is the personal relation of Lord

Elements of Feudalism in England, but no Feudal System.

Two elements of Feudalism; the relation of the

¹ Domesday is our great authority for the various classes of men from the Thegn downwards. With Domesday must be compared several documents in the collections of our ancient Laws; but it seems on the whole better to take Domesday as the text, and to treat the minor documents as illustrative comments.

CHAP. III.

Comitatus
and the
holding of
land by
military
service.

Military
tenures
suggested
by the rela-
tion of the
Comitatus,

and also by
the Roman
tenures on
the fron-
tier.

The two
elements
united
produce
Feudalism.

Growth of
Feudalism
slower in
England
than on the
Continent.

and Vassal, bound together by mutual will and mutual fidelity, the one owing service, the other owing protection ; there is, in short, the old Teutonic relation of the *Comitatus*, the relation of the Hlaford and his Thegn. But, alongside of this, the feudal relation commonly implies the holding of land by military service. To grant land on such a tenure is in truth one form, one among several, of that bounty of the Lord to his followers to which his very title of *Hlaford* is owing. The Lord makes his follower a grant of land as the reward of past services, and he makes the continuation of those services the condition of his follower's retaining the land. But there can be no doubt that the tendency to this particular form of bounty was greatly strengthened by the example of the Roman practice of granting out frontier lands to be held by military service.¹ The holders of such lands held them of the Roman Republic, and to the Roman Republic their service was due. They stood in no personal relation to the Emperor ; they were not his "men," his vassals, his *Gesiðas*, his Thegns ; their service was due to him only so far as he was the head and representative of the Commonwealth. But the union in the same person of the Teutonic tie of the *Comitatus* and the Roman tie of land held by military service would produce a relation coming very near to the strictly feudal relation. The Roman custom would easily suggest to the Teutonic conquerors the practice of rewarding their followers with grants of lands—in short, with benefices or fiefs—as the most convenient and honourable form for the bounty of the Lord to take. In Britain doubtless, where Roman institutions were so utterly swept away, this influence would hardly exist ; at any rate it would be far weaker than it was on the Continent. Hence we find Feudalism growing up more slowly in England than elsewhere ; in our old

¹ Palgrave, *English Commonwealth*, i. 354.

constitution we find the elements of Feudalism; but they were not as yet worked into a systematic shape; they had not as yet become the materials of an elaborate jurisprudence. Homage was there; for the relation of every man to his Lord was a relation of homage. Military tenure was there; for much land was held by military tenure. Heriots too and other feudal incidents existed. But these feudal elements had not yet been wrought together into any harmonious Feudal System. The relation of Lord and Vassal existed, and the relation of military tenure existed; but vassalage and military tenure had not yet been inseparably welded together. The *Comitatus*, the germ of Feudalism, had thriven and developed, and was now dominant; but the old Teutonic constitution had not been utterly wiped out. The Norman Conquest no doubt strongly tended to promote the further development of the feudal element; but, as in every other case, it only opened and prepared the way for further changes. The legislator of Feudalism in England was, I must once more say, Henry of Anjou.

Feudal
element
strengthened by
the Norman Conquest.

The military service due from land held by a feudal tenure is strictly due to the Lord as the Lord. That Lord may be the King; but, if so, the service is still, in strictness, owing to him, not as head of the state, but as Lord of the fief. But there is another obligation to military service which is older than this. All land in England was, by the earliest Common Law, subject to three burthens, to contributions to the three works most necessary for the defence of the country. These were the famous *Trinoda Necessitas*, the obligation to service in the field (*fyrð*) and to a share in the repairs of fortresses and of bridges. But these are the duties of the citizen to the commonwealth, or of the subject to the Sovereign, not the duty of the personal Vassal to his personal Lord. His land, in an age when there

Earlier form of military service; the *Trinoda Necessitas*.

CHAP. III. was little property except in land, is simply taken as the measure of the contribution due from him to the common defence. From these burthens, as a rule, no land could be free; even church-lands were regularly subject to them, though in some cases their owners contrived to obtain exemptions. These ancient obligations pressed alike on the ancient allodial possession and on the land held by any more modern tenure. They were not feudal services, but a tax paid to the state. They were in fact the price paid to the commonwealth for its protection, or rather they were the share which each member of the commonwealth was bound to take in the protection of himself and his neighbours.

Folkland
and Book-
land.

I have already mentioned the *folkland*, the common land of the community or of the nation, out of which the ancient allodial possessions were carved. This process of turning public property into private went on largely in later times. The alienation was now commonly made by a document in writing, under the signatures of the King and his Witan; land so granted was therefore said to be *booked* to the grantee, and was known as *bookland* (*bócland*). Portions of the folkland were thus cut off from the public ownership, and were booked to private corporations or individuals. The greater portion of the ancient Charters still preserved consists of grants of this kind. A vast number are of course in favour of the Church, but those which are made to the King's faithful Thegns are hardly less numerous. In either case portions of the folkland are alienated, "booked," to private use with the consent of the Witan. Of course the booking might be made on any terms; any sort of tenure might be created; but the great object of the grantee was to get the land as pure *eðel* or *alod*, subject only to the three inevitable burthens. The King's Thegns, to whom so many of these grants are made, are exactly

Conversion
of Folk-
land into
Bookland
in favour
of the
Church
and of the
King's
Thegns.

the class of persons who, under a systematic Feudalism, would receive benefices granted on a feudal tenure. And in many cases they did receive what may fairly be called feudal benefices. But of course the man who could get land booked to him on the same terms as an ancient *ædel*, was in incomparably greater good luck.¹

The folkland, the common property of the state, was of course at the disposal of the state, but of the state only. It was granted by the King, but only by the consent and authority of his Witan.² That is to say, in modern language, the change of folkland into bookland required an Act of Parliament, but Acts to that effect were passed constantly and without difficulty. The folkland belonged to the nation and not to the King. The King was only its chief administrator, enjoying its use, so far as he enjoyed it, only as the head and representative of the nation. But the King, like any other

¹ I will quote two specimens of these grants. In 977 (Cod. Dipl. iii. 157) King Eadward makes a grant to Ælfric (which Ælfric?) in these terms; "Aliquam partem terræ juris mei perpetuali donatione libenter concedo cuidam fidei meo ministro [þegn] vocitato nomine Ælfric, ob illius amabile obsequium dignatus sum largiri." He is to have it in full property, with the right of bequest, and to hold it free of all services "exceptis istis tribus, expeditione, pontis arcisve munitione." So Æthelred in 982 (Cod. Dipl. iii. 188) grants "ruris quamdam sed communem portionem, quam hujus nationis indigenæ unitato at Stoce nuncupant onomate, cuiuspiam mihi *pistice* [one thinks of the *παιστήριον* in the *Persians* of Æschylus] devotione subnixo vocitamine Leofrico." The grantee is to have full power of bequest, and to hold the land "ab omni terrenæ servitutis jugo liberum, exceptâ expeditione, pontis arcisve restauratione." Terrible curses are imprecated on any one who shall disturb the grantees in their possession.

Bishops make grants to their own Thegns of church lands to be held for one, two, or three lives, and then to revert to the Church. The Codex contains a great many grants of this kind made by Bishop Oswald, the grant being made by leave of the King and of the reigning Ealdorman of the Mercians. In one, in English, which immediately follows the grant to Ælfric (iii. 159), we find the *trinoda necessitas* duly excepted. "Sic hit sælces þinges freoh búton ferdfare and walgeworc and brycggeorc and cyrcanlæde."

² The Charter to Leofric is made "his testibus consentientibus quorum inferius nomina caraxantur." So Eadgar (iii. 153) makes a grant "optimum meorum utens consilio," &c., &c.

Conversion of Folkland into Bookland required the assent of the Witan.

CHAP. III. man, had his private estate. Like any other man, he might have his ancient allodial property, or he might, like any other man, have land booked to him, land which followed the ordinary course of legal succession or testamentary disposal.¹ It was indeed absolutely needful that the King should have such private possessions; for, in our ancient elective monarchy, the reigning King had no certainty that the Crown, and the possessions attached to the Crown, would ever pass to his descendants. But, after the Norman Conquest, as the royal power increased, and as the modern notion of hereditary right was gradually developed, these two kinds of possession got confounded. On the one hand, the nation was forgotten or merged in the person of its chief; the Folkland was held to be the King's land, *Terra Regis*; the King was led to look on the possessions of the nation as his own, and to grant them away at his own pleasure without the consent of Parliament. On the other hand, lawyers brought in the strange doctrine that the King could hold no private property, but that, on his accession to the Crown, his private estate was merged in what was now held to be the royal domain. By one of those curious cycles which so often come round in human affairs, one of these wrongs has been redressed formally and the other practically. Our modern Kings have recovered the ancient right, common to them with other men, of inheriting, purchasing, and bequeathing private estates. On the other hand, now that the royal domain is given up to the nation to be controlled by Parliament, it is practically restored to its ancient condition of Folkland. That is to say, after so many centuries of usurpation, the land of which the Kings had defrauded the nation has come back to its lawful owners.

The King's
private
estate.

Folkland
passes into
*Terra
Regis*,

and be-
comes
Folkland
again.

¹ See Allen, pp. 143, 153 et seqq.; also on the whole subject of the change of Folkland into *Terra Regis*.

us means the old system of free Teutonic CHAP. III.
 gradually died out in England, as it died out The old
 the Continent save one. It lingered in Teutonic
 the fifteenth century; ¹ in the primitive constitution gra-
 lingers still. Everywhere else it has utterly dually dies
 as left only such faint traces as it has left out every-
 But England has not suffered from where but
 as Germany has. Our free marks and shires in Switzer-
 have given way, but they have given way be- land.
 development of a real national existence, before It yields in
 the establishment of a really national sovereignty. But England
 in Germany local freedom was rooted out, not in favour to a real
 either of the nation or of its sovereign, but for the national
 advantage of that crowd of princes, great and small, monarchy,
 which have for ages been the curse of the land. in Ger-
 free communities of Germany vanished; but the German many to
 On gained nothing, the German King gained nothing; the domi-
 liberties and rights alike of the King, of the nation, nion of
 of the local communities, were confiscated to the profit petty
 brood of petty despots. The constitution which Ta- princes.
 saw and wondered at, the constitution for which Armi-
 and conquered, the constitution whose working
 may still be seen year by year in the free air of Uri and
 Appenzell, gave way in the great Teutonic realm to the do-
 minion of princes who represented nothing but themselves,
 who represented no national or provincial existence, who
 were the mere creation of modern dynastic and diplomatic
 arrangements,—arrangements which have done their best
 to wipe out every historic name and every national memory,
 and to assign to each of their princely creatures an arbi-
 trary extent of dominion traced out at haphazard upon the
 map.² Such has been the fate of the Teutonic continent;

¹ See Eichhorn, Deutsche Staats-und Rechtsgeschichte, iii. 158.

² This was written before the late wonderful changes in Germany (August, 1866), which will supply me with abundant matter for another work.

CHAP. III. such has happily not been the fate of the Teutonic island.

The uprooting of the old free communities, the growth of the power of the King and of his Thegns, no doubt tended, in England, as elsewhere, to the degradation, at

• Ceorldom
sinks into
Villainage,
but the
Villains
are gra-
dually
emanci-
pated.

Change of
the old
constitu-
tion neces-
sary.

Shires
formed out
of Marks,
and King-
doms out
of Shires.

The Mark-
system pro-
bably less
perfect in
England
than else-
where.

least for a while, of the lowest class of freemen. The Ceorl was fast sinking into the Villain. Still, even in the worst times, enough of the old spirit remained in our laws to give the villain means of obtaining enfranchisement which gradually did enfranchise the whole class, without the institution of villainage ever being formally done away with. And the uprooting of the old communities was necessary, if England was ever to become a great and united nation. We must remember that the Kingdom, like all our ancient divisions, from the shire, perhaps from the hundred, upwards, was formed by the aggregation of smaller divisions.¹ The unit is the Mark, roughly represented by the modern parish or manor. The Shire must not be looked on as a division of the Kingdom or the Mark as a division of the Shire. The Shire is in truth formed by an aggregation of Marks and the Kingdom by an aggregation of Shires. The aggregation of Marks into Shires is indeed mainly to be inferred from local nomenclature and from the analogy of other Teutonic countries, but the aggregation of Shires into Kingdoms is matter of recorded history. It is even possible that the circumstances of the English Conquest of Britain may have hindered the Mark from ever possessing the same amount of independence in England which it possessed in the older Teutonic lands. When every English settlement had to defend itself, and, if possible, to extend itself, in the teeth of a hostile Welsh population, the different settlements must have kept up a very close union; there must have been, if not centralization, at

¹ On this whole subject I must again refer to Mr. Kemble, especially to his Chapter on the Mark and the Shire.

on, from the beginning. The first followers of Cerdic doubt settled themselves in Marks, forming communities; but they must all have held ready to march at Cerdic's command, whenever needed to repel an inroad of the Welsh, or make a fresh inroad upon them. Still such as, the Mark and the Shire, however dependent externally on some central authority, were doubtless internally self-governed from the beginning. We have already seen¹ how Shires, ruled each one by its own Ealdorman, coalesced into Kingdoms under a single King. We have seen also that the nature of the process differed in different parts of the country, that in Mercia, for instance, wholly independent states were thus brought into union, while in Wessex, though there were many Ealdormen and even many Kings, there was still a certain unity from the first. There was always a head King of the West-Saxons, and probably all the under-Kings were Æthelings of the blood of Cerdic. Gradually the connexion became closer, the process no doubt being quicker in Wessex than in Mercia or Northumberland. The head King became the only King, the only independent Executive, and the assembly of his Witan became the only independent legislature. In place of Kings, independent or dependent, the Shires received Ealdormen, named by the King and his Witan, and liable to be removed by them. The Folkland of the Shire became the Folkland of the whole Kingdom. A crowd of royal officers² of various

Formation of the greater Kingdoms.

Process of amalgamation;

¹ See above, pp. 26, 78.
² See again Mr. Kemble's Chapter on the Gerefa. The Gerefa or Reeve is an officer, especially a fiscal officer, of any kind, from a Shirereve down to a Dykereve—Mr. Kemble adds, to a Hogreeve. In Northern English the word, under the form of Grieve, has changed from a public to a private exactor. The word is the same as the High-Dutch Graf; only the one title has risen and the other has fallen. A Burggraf is a greater man than a Boroughreeve.

CHAP. III.
royal offi-
cers in the
Shires.

ranks, whose main duty was to look after the royal interests, were established in all parts of the country. The Ealdorman still remained, the shadow of ancient kingship, and so far the representative of local independence. But beside him arose a new officer, the *Scirgerefa*, *Shirereeve*, or *Sheriff*, the immediate officer of the King, the agent of the central authority, the representative of the dependence of each local division on the common King and Assembly of the nation. Once the Shires were the units, out of the amalgamation of which the Kingdom was formed; now the Kingdom forms a new whole, of which the Shires have sunk to be mere administrative divisions. In Mercia we have seen¹ that, after the Danish Conquest, the country was probably artificially mapped out again into fresh Shires, which must have been felt to be still more completely mere administrative divisions than the West-Saxon Shires which had once been separate principalities.

§ 3. *Origin and Powers of the Witenagemót.*

Demo-
cratic
constitu-
tion of the
old As-
semblies.

The As-
sembly of
the Mark,

By these means those great Kingdoms were formed which produced Bretwaldas and contended for the supremacy of Britain. Each stage of amalgamation increased the kingly power; each stage lessened the independence of local communities and lessened the importance of their individual members. The democratic character of the old Teutonic system contained the seeds of its own destruction, whenever it should be applied to districts of any great extent. We may be sure that every Teutonic freeman had a voice in the Assembly—the *Gemót*, the *Gemeinde*, the *Ekklésia*—of his own Mark. In fact he in some sort retains it still, as holding his place in the parish vestry. He had a voice;—it might be too much to say that he had a vote;

¹ See above, p. 49.

for, in an early state of things, formal divisions are not likely to be often taken; the temper of the Assembly is found out by easier means. But the man who clashed his arms to express approval, or who joined in the unmistakeable sound which expressed dissent,¹ practically gave as efficient a vote as if he had solemnly walked out into a lobby. The Homeric *Agoré* is the type of every such Assembly, and the likeness of the Homeric *Agoré* may be seen in an English County-meeting to this day.² The voice which the simple freeman, the Ceorl, had in the Assembly of his Mark, he would not lose in the Assembly of his Shire, the *Scirgemót*. The County Court is to this day an assembly of all the freeholders of the Shire. But the right of attending the Assembly of the Shire would become really less valuable than the right of attending the Assembly of the Mark. The larger the assembly, the more distant the place of meeting, the more difficult, and therefore the more rare, does the attendance of individual members become, and the smaller is the importance of each individual member when he gets there. Then, no doubt, as well as now, a man who was a great man in the Assembly of his own Mark, who was somebody in the Assembly of his own Shire, would find himself a mere nobody in an Assembly of the freemen of all Wessex. We cannot doubt that the Assemblies of the Mark, of the Shire, and of the Kingdom all coexisted; but at each stage of amalgamation the competence of the inferior Assembly would be narrowed. We cannot doubt that every freeman retained in theory the right of appearing in the Assembly of the Kingdom, no less than in the Assemblies of the Mark and of the Shire. Expressions

CHAP. III.

of the Shire.

The right becomes less valuable with each extension of area.

Every freeman had a theoretical right to attend the National Assembly.

¹ Tac. Germ. 11. "Si displicuit sententia, fremitu adspernantur; sin placuit, frameas concutunt. Honoratissimum adsensus genus est, armis laudare."

² I must again refer to Mr. Gladstone's remarks on this subject. Cf. National Review, July 1858, p. 68.

CHAP. III. are found which are quite enough to show that the mass of the people were theoretically looked on as present in the National Assembly and as consenting to its decrees.¹ But such a right of attendance of course became purely nugatory.² The mass of the people could not attend, they would not care to attend, they would find themselves of no account if they did attend. They would therefore, without any formal abrogation of their right, gradually cease from attending. The idea of representation had not yet arisen; those who did not appear in person had no means of appearing by deputy; of election or delegation there is not the slightest trace, though it might

The right goes practically out of use.

¹ Take for instance the very beginning of recorded English legislation, the Doms of Æthelberht (Thorpe, i. 2); "Gif cyning his *leode* to him gehated." *Leode* here surely means *people* in the widest sense. So in the Preface to the Laws of Wihtræd (p. 36), "Ðær þa eadigan fundon mid ealra gemedum þas domas." The great men propose, the people accept, just as in the *Concilia* described by Tacitus. So the deposition of Sigebert in 755 (of which more hereafter) was, according to Henry of Huntingdon, who is clearly translating some earlier writer, the act of the whole West-Saxon people; "Congregati sunt proceres et *populus totius regni*, et provida deliberatione et *unanimes consensu omnium* expulsus est a regno. Kinewlf vero, juvenis egregius de regia stirpe oriundus, electus est in Regem." So the "Decretum Episcoporum et aliorum sapientum de Kanciâ," addressed to Æthelstan (Thorpe, i. 216), whatever its exact bearing, is drawn up in the name of the "Thaini, Comites [Eorlas], et Villani [Ceorlas]." So in the "Judicia Civitatis Lundoniæ," (p. 228, Schmid, 156) are confirmed by all, "ægder ge eorlisce ge ceorlisce," in the Latin "Comites et Villani." So in the Chronicles a popular element is often mentioned in the election of Kings. In 1016 Eadmund is chosen by the Witan and the Citizens (burhwaru) of London. They, being on the spot, could exercise the right which in the mass of the people lay dormant. So in 1036 Harold the First is chosen by most of the Thegns north of Thames and by the *liðsmen* or sailors of London. In 1041 "*all folk* chose Eadward to King." In 1066 Harold took the Kingdom "*as men* chose him thereto." Expressions like these might be used with perfect propriety by a representative body, but they could hardly be used by a body not representative, unless it, in theory at least, took in the whole nation.

² See Mr. Kemble's Chapter on the Witenagemót, especially ii. 192, 196. In the note on the last page he refutes the strange notion of Sir Francis Palgrave that there was a property qualification for members of the Witenagemót.

DEMOCRACY

CHAP. III.

at those who stayed away might feel that their official neighbour who went would attend and would fairly act in their interests. an originally democratic assembly, without exclusion of any class of its members, gradually shrunk up into an aristocratic assembly. I trust shown in another work¹ how, under closely analogous circumstances, the Federal Assembly of Achaia, open to every Achaian citizen, was practically only by those who were both rich and zealous, attended and how it often happened that the members of the inner body, the Senate, themselves alone formed the Assembly. So an Assembly of all the freemen of Wessex, when those freemen could not attend personally, and when they had no means of attending by representatives, gradually changed into an Assembly attended by few or none but the King's

The Assembly practically an Assembly of the King's Thegns.

These men **128.** The great officers of Church and State, Ealdors, Bishops, Abbots, would attend; the ordinary Thegns would attend more laxly, but still in considerable numbers; the King would preside; a few leading men would disapprove or not, would make their approval or disapproval of the general mass of the Thegns, whether they attended or not, felt; no doubt the form still remained of the ordinary freemen whom curiosity had drawn to the spot; most likely the form still remained of demanding their ceremonial assent, though

Vestiges of the old popular rights.

¹ Hist. of Federal Government, i. 266. We may be sure however, both from the smaller extent of the country and from the political instincts of the Greek mind, that popular attendance never died out so completely in Achaia as it did in England. And in both cases, no doubt, those who lived in the neighbourhood of the place of meeting would often attend when people from a distance did not. The attendance of the citizens of London just mentioned may be compared with the appearance of a vast number of Corinthian citizens of inferior rank in an assembly held at Corinth, which is spoken of as unusual. Polybius, xxxviii. 4. Hist. Fed. Gov. i. 263.

CHAP. III. without any fear that the habitual "Yea, yea," would ever be exchanged for "Nay, nay."¹ It is thus that, in the absence of representation, a democratic franchise, as applied to a large country, gradually becomes unreal or delusive.² A primary assembly, an *Ekklésia*, a *Landes-gemeinde*, is an excellent institution in a commonwealth so small as to allow of its really being worked with effect. But, in any large community, it either becomes a tumultuous mob, like the later Roman Comitia or the Florentine Parliament, or else it gradually shrinks up into an aristocratic body, as the old Teutonic Assemblies did both in England and on the Continent. When the great statesmen of the thirteenth century, Earl Simon and King Edward, fully established the principle of representation, they did but bring back the old state of things in another shape. The ordinary freeman had gradually lost his right of personal attendance in the National Assembly; it was inexpedient and impossible to restore that right to him in its original shape; he

Primary Assemblies suited only to small commonwealths.

The ancient right restored in another shape in the thirteenth century.

¹ The passages which I have already quoted seem to imply the existence of some such usage, but it is almost proved, without going any further, by the custom which still exists of presenting the King at his Coronation for the acceptance of the people. This is at once the last vestige of our elective monarchy, and the last vestige of the ancient right of the Teutonic freeman to take a direct part in the affairs of the nation.

As late as 1461, Edward Earl of March was elected King by a tumultuous assembly of the citizens of London, a vestige of the right which they had more regularly exercised in the elections of Eadmund Ironside and of Harold the son of Cnut.

² Cf. Arist. Pol. iv. 5. 3. οὐ δεῖ δὲ λαθάνειν ὅτι πολλαχοῦ συμβέβηκεν ὥστε τὴν μὲν πολιτείαν τὴν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους μὴ δημοτικὴν εἶναι, διὰ δὲ τὸ ἦθος καὶ τὴν ἀγωγὴν πολιτεύεσθαι δημοτικῶς, ὁμοίως δὲ πάλιν παρ' ἄλλοις τὴν μὲν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους εἶναι πολιτείαν δημοτικωτέραν, τῇ δ' ἀγωγῇ καὶ τοῖς ἔθεσιν ὀλιγαρχεῖσθαι μᾶλλον. I suspect that both these descriptions are in a manner applicable to the Old-English constitution. The latter is so on the face of it; the democratic theory veiled an oligarchic reality. But it seems not unlikely that the former may be true also, and that the narrow body into which the ancient free assembly had shrunk up may still in practice have fairly expressed the sense of the nation.

may be considered as having in the thirteenth century legally surrendered it, and as having received in its stead the far more practical right of attending by his representatives. CHAP. III.

Thus was formed that famous assembly of our forefathers, called by various names, the *Mycel Gemót* or *Great Meeting*, the *Witenagemót*¹ or *Meeting of the Wise*, sometimes the *Mycel Getheah* or *Great Thought*.² But the common title of those who compose it is simply the *Witan*, the *Sapientes* or *Wise Men*. In every English Kingdom we find the royal power narrowly limited by the necessity under which the King lay of acting in all matters of importance by the consent and authority of his *Witan*, in other words, of his Parliament. As the other Kingdoms merged in Wessex, the *Witan* of the other Kingdoms became entitled to seats in the *Gemót* of Wessex, now become the common *Gemót* of the Empire. But, just as in the case of the assemblies of the Mark and the Shire, so the *Gemóts* of the other Kingdoms seem to have gone on as local bodies, dealing with local affairs, and perhaps giving a formal assent to the resolutions of the central body.³ As to the constitution of these Great Councils in any English Kingdom our information is of the vaguest kind. The members are always described in the loosest way. We find the

The Witenagemót.

The *Gemót* of Wessex becomes the general Legislature, those of the other Kingdoms surviving as local bodies.

Lack of information as to the constitution of the Assembly.

¹ *Witena-Gemót* = *Sapientum concilium*. Sir Francis Palgrave suggests (i. 143) that *Witan* is used in the sense of *witnesses*; but *sapientes* is the common Latin translation. The Senate of Bremen used to be called "Die Wittheit," and the Senators of all three Hanseatic Towns were till lately called "hoch-und wohl-Weisheit."

² One might say, in all seriousness, ψυχῶν σόφων τοῦτ' ἐστὶ φροντιστήριον.

³ In 1004 Ulfkytel, seemingly Ealdorman of the East-Angles, assembles the local *Gemót*; "þa gerædde Ulfkytel wið þa witan on East-Englum."

The letter from the Kentish men to Æthelstan, quoted in a former note, reads like an act of acceptance, on the part of a local *Gemót*, of resolutions passed by the general body.

CHAP. III. Witan constantly assembling, constantly passing laws, but we find no law prescribing or defining the constitution of the Assembly itself. We find no trace of representation or election; we find no trace of any property qualification;¹ we find no trace of nomination by the Crown, except in so far as all the great officers of the Court and the Kingdom were constantly present. On the other hand we have seen that all the leading men, Ealdormen, Bishops, Abbots, and a considerable body of other Thegns, did attend; we have seen that the people as a body were in some way associated with the legislative acts of their chiefs, that those acts were in some sort the acts of the people themselves, to which they had themselves assented, not merely the edicts of superiors which they had to obey. We have seen that, on some particular occasions, some classes at least of the people did actually take a part in the proceedings of the National Council; thus the citizens of London are more than once recorded to have taken a share in the election of Kings.² No theory that I know of will explain all these phænomena except that which I have just tried to draw out. This is, that every freeman had an abstract right to be present, but that any actual participation in the proceedings of the assembly had, gradually and imperceptibly, come to be confined to the leading men, to the King's Thegns, strengthened, under peculiarly favourable circumstances, by the presence of exceptional classes of freemen, like the London citizens.³ It

¹ See above, p. 108.

² *Ib.*

³ It must be remembered that the Witan did not habitually meet either in London or in any other of the chief towns. Possibly, when a Gemót was held at Winchester or Exeter, the citizens of those towns would hold the same position as the Londoners did when the Gemót was held in their city. Something of this sort seems to be referred to in a Charter of Æthelstan (Cod. Dipl. ii. 194) of the year 934—remarkable on other grounds from the vast number of signatures, including four vassal Kings, and

is therefore utterly vain for any political party to try to press the supposed constitution of our ancient National Councils into the service of modern political warfare. The Meeting of the Wise has not a word to utter for or against any possible Reform Bill. In one sense it was more democratic than anything that the most advanced Liberal would venture to dream of; in another sense it was more oligarchic than anything that the most unbending Conservative would venture to defend. Yet it may in practice have fairly represented the wishes of the nation; and, if so, no people ever enjoyed more complete political freedom than the English did in these early times. For the powers of the ancient Witenagemót¹ surpassed beyond all measure the powers which our written Law vests in a modern Parliament. In some respects they surpassed the powers which our conventional Constitution vests in the House of Commons. The King could do absolutely nothing without the consent of his Wise Men. First of all, it was from them that he derived his political being, and it was on them that he depended for its continuance. The Witan chose the King and the Witan could depose him. The power of deposition is a power which, from its very nature, can be exercised but rarely; we therefore do not find many Kings deposed by Act of Parliament either before or since the Norman Conquest. But we do find instances, both before and since that event, which show that, by the ancient constitution of England, the Witan of the land did possess the right of deposing the sovereign, and that, on great and emergent occasions, they did not shrink

The Witenagemót proves nothing in modern political controversies.

Extent of the powers of the Assembly;

greater than those of a modern Parliament.

Power of deposing the King.

evidently passed in what was indeed a *Mycel Gemót*. It is given "in civitate opinatissimâ [sic] quæ Winteceaster nuncupatur, totâ populi generalitate sub alis regis dapsilitatis ovanti." The citizens of London, and those of Winchester too, seem both to be mentioned as electors of Kings as late as the accession of Stephen. See W. Malm., Hist. Nov. i. 11.

¹ The powers of the Witan are drawn out in form by Kemble, ii. 204.

CHAP. III. from exercising that right. I will not attempt to grapple with the confused history of Northumberland, where at one time Kings were set up and put down almost daily. Such revolutions were doubtless as much the result of force as of any legal process; still we can hardly doubt that the legal forms were commonly observed, and in one case we find it distinctly recorded that they were.¹ Let us confine ourselves to the better attested history of the line of Cerdic. Four times—we might more truly say five times—twice before and twice since the Norman Conquest, has the King of the West-Saxons or of the English been deprived of his kingly office by the voice of his Parliament. Sigeberht of Wessex, in the eighth century, was deposed by the vote of the General Assembly of his Kingdom, and another King elected in his stead.² Æthelred the Second was deposed by one act of the Legislature and restored by another.³ Edward the Second was deposed by Parliament; so was Richard the Second.⁴ At a later time the Parliament of England

Instances in Northumberland;
in Wessex.
Sigeberht. 755.
Æthelred deposed, 1013; restored, 1014.
Edward the Se-

¹ Ealhbred of Northumberland was deposed in 774. See the Chronicles and Florence under the year. But the local historian, Simeon of Durham, gives the act a more legal character than would be inferred from the words of the southern writer. "*Consilio et consensu suorum omnium, regis familie ac principum destitutus societate, exilio imperii mutavit majestatem.*"

² The whole case of Sigeberht, important on many grounds, is fully discussed by Kemble, ii. 219. Henry of Huntingdon, whom I have already quoted (p. 108), gives the clearest account, but all, the Chronicles, Florence, and Æthelweard, distinctly assert or admit the action of the Witan. How far the Witan were influenced by any intrigues of Cynewulf—the Henry of Lancaster or William of Orange of the story—is not to the purpose. The point is the legal right, not the justice of its exercise, though the crimes of Sigeberht are asserted by all the other writers, and admitted even by Æthelweard.

³ The case of Æthelred I shall discuss in a later Chapter.

⁴ Henry the Sixth was not, strictly speaking, deposed. By deposition I understand an act by which a King, whose right to be King is acknowledged up to that time, is, by virtue of such act, declared to be no longer King. This was not exactly the case with Henry the Sixth. When Richard Duke of York claimed the Crown in preference to Henry, a compromise was made by which Henry was to retain the Crown for life and

shrank from the formal deposition of James the Second, and took refuge in a theory of abdication which, though logically absurd, practically did all that was wanted.¹ But the Parliament of Scotland had no such scruples, and that body, in full conformity with ancient examples, declared the Crown of Scotland to be forfeited. In a land where everything goes by precedent, a right resting on a tradition like this, though its actual exercise may have taken place only four or five times in nine hundred years, is surely as well established as any other. Under our modern constitution the right is likely to remain dormant.

CHAP. III.
cond and
Richard
the Second
deposed.
Case of
James the
Second.

The objects which in past times required the deposition of the King, if not from his office, at least from his authority,² can now be obtained by a parliamentary censure of the Prime Minister, or, in the extreme case, by bringing an impeachment against him.

If the Witan could depose the King, still more undoubtedly did the Witan elect the King. It is strange

The King
elected by
the Witan.

Richard was to become his heir-apparent. It was therefore the Yorkist theory that Henry reigned by virtue of this agreement, and that, when he afterwards, as was alleged, broke the agreement, the Crown was thereby forfeited and the Duke became *de jure* King. Yet, as we have seen, a sort of popular election was thought desirable to confirm the rights of his son. Charles the First, it is still more clear, was not deposed. He was tried and executed *being* King, a process of which English history certainly supplies no other example.

¹ On the character of this famous vote, logically so absurd, yet practically so thoroughly adapted to all the circumstances of the time, see Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.* ii. 623. So on the vote of the Scottish Estates, iii. 285.

² As was done in the cases of Henry the Third, Edward the Second, and Richard the Second; the act in the two latter cases being a sort of forewarning of the severer punishment which was to follow.

With the later fates of the deposed Kings, the certain murder of Edward, the all but certain murder of Richard, the constitutional question has nothing to do. The deposed prince was let off the most easily in the earliest case. Sigebert, deposed from the Kingdom of Wessex, was allowed to retain Hampshire as under-King. Having murdered one of his Ealdormen, he was banished altogether by Cynwulf, the new head-King, and he was afterwards himself killed by a private enemy.

CHAP. III. how people's eyes are blinded on this subject. It is not uncommon to hear people talk about the times before and shortly after the Norman Conquest as if the Act for the Settlement of the Royal Succession had already been in force in those days. It is strange to hear a number of princes, both before and since the Conquest, popularly spoken of as "usurpers," merely because they came to the Crown in a different way from that which modern law and custom prescribe. It is strange that people who talk in this way, commonly forget that their own principle, so far as it proves anything, proves a great deal more than they intend. If Harold, Stephen, John,¹ were usurpers, Ælfred and Eadward the Confessor were usurpers just as much. Ælfred and Eadward, no less than John, succeeded by election, to the exclusion of nephews whom the modern law of England would look upon as the undoubted heirs of the Crown. All this sounds very strange to the historic mind; but it may, in some cases, be the result of simple ignorance. It is stranger still to hear others talk as if hereditary succession, according to some particular theory of it,² was a divine and eternal law which could not be

Popular
misconcep-
tions on
this sub-
ject.

¹ The infamy of John's reign in no way affects his right to the Crown, which was perfectly good. It does not appear that Arthur of Brittany, who is commonly spoken of as having a better right, had any partizans in England at all.

² What is hereditary right? If hereditary succession be a divine and eternal law, we should at least be told what that law is. But the laws of those nations which admit hereditary succession differ infinitely as to the rule of succession which they enforce. The succession of the eldest son does not rest either on any divine precept or on any general consent of mankind. If William Rufus was not the eldest son of William the Conqueror, neither was Solomon the eldest son of David. If Robert had a party in his favour, so had Adonijah. Many a monarchy, from that of the Carolingian Empire down to the smallest German Duchies, has been dealt with according to a sort of gavelkind, and there seems no reason in the nature of things why a Crown might not go by borough-English. The English law allows the succession of females, the French law forbids it. The Turkish law gives the succession to the eldest male of the royal family, whatever be his degree of kindred to the last Sultan. The plain truth is that, whether there be

departed from without sin. Our forefathers at any rate CHAP. III. knew nothing of any such superstitions. The ancient English Kingship was elective. It was elective in the same sense in which all the old Teutonic Kingdoms were elective. Among a people in whose eyes birth was highly valued, it was deemed desirable that the King should be the descendant of illustrious and royal ancestors. In the days of heathendom it was held that the King should come of the supposed stock of the Gods. These feelings everywhere pointed to some particular house as the royal house, the house whose members had a special claim on the suffrages of the electors. In every Kingdom there was a royal family, out of which alone, under all ordinary circumstances, Kings were chosen; but within that royal family the Witan of the land had a free choice. The eldest son of the last King would doubtless always have a preference; if he was himself at all worthy of the place, if his father's memory was at all cherished, he would commonly be preferred without hesitation, probably chosen without the appearance of any other candidate. But a preference was all to which he was entitled, and he seems not to have been entitled even to a preference unless he was actually the son of a crowned King.¹ If he were too young, or otherwise disqualified, the electors passed him by and chose some worthier member of the royal family. Ælfred and Eadred were chosen in preference to the minor sons of elder brothers. Eadward the Confessor was chosen in preference to the absent son of an elder brother. At the death of Eadgar, when the royal family contained only minors to choose from, the electors were divided between

Kings commonly chosen out of a particular family.

The eldest son of the last King has a preference, but no more.

Minors constantly passed by.

any King at all—whether, if there be a King, he shall be elective or hereditary—what, if the Crown be hereditary, shall be the law of succession—are all points for the municipal law of each country to settle for itself.

¹ I shall speak of this point when I come to the disputed election after the death of Eadgar.

CHAP. III. the elder and the younger brother. Minors passed by at one time might or might not be elected at a later vacancy. Æthelwold, the son of Æthelred the First, who had been passed by in favour of his uncle Ælfred, was again passed by on Ælfred's death, because no claim could compare with that of Eadward, the worthy son of the most glorious of fathers. The children of Eadmund were passed by in favour of their uncle Eadred, but on Eadred's death, the choice fell on the formerly excluded Eadwig.

A certain preference acquired by the recommendation of the last King.

And, as a certain preference was acquired by birth, a certain preference was acquired by the recommendation of the late King. So Eadgar recommended his elder son Eadward to the electors; so Eadward the Confessor recommended Harold. Æthelwulf had long before attempted, by the help of a will confirmed by the Witan, to establish a peculiar law of succession, which soon broke down.¹ But it seems clear that a certain importance was attached to the wishes of a deceased and respected King, as conveying a distinct preference. But it was no more than a preference; the person who had this advantage, whether by birth or nomination, could still be passed by without breach of constitutional right. From these principles it follows that, as any disqualified person in the royal family might be passed by, so, if the whole family were disqualified, the whole family might be passed by.² That is to say, the

Harold the son of God-

¹ See Ælfred's will in Cod. Dipl. ii. 112, v. 127; and the account of Æthelwulf's will in Florence, 855. See Pauli's Life of Ælfred, pp. 103, 104 (Eng. Tran.).

² The best explanation of the ancient doctrine as to the election of Kings is to be found in the speech which Matthew Paris (p. 197, Wats) puts into the mouth of Archbishop Hubert at the election of King John. Whether the speech is Hubert's or Matthew's matters little, or rather, if it be Matthew's own, it is the more valuable, as carrying on the ancient tradition still later. No one has any right to be King unless he be chosen by the whole people of the land on account of his merits ("Nullus præviâ ratione alii succedere habet regnum, nisi ab *universitate regni* unanimiter, invocâtâ Spiritûs gratiâ, electus"), but if any member of the royal family be worthy, he is to be preferred to any one else ("Verum si quis ex stirpe Regis defuncti

election of Harold the son of Godwine, the central point of this history, was perfectly good in every point of view. The earlier election of Cnut was equally good in point of form ; only it was an election under *duresse*—*duresse* a little, but not much, stronger than that under which an English Chapter elects its Bishop.

CHAP. III.

wine law-fully chosen.

Cnut's election good in form, but made under *duresse*.

An ancient English King then was, as his very title implied, not the Father of his people, but their child, their creation. And the Assembly which had elected him, and which could depose him, claimed to direct him by its advice and authority in almost every exercise of the kingly power. Every act of government of any importance was done, not by the King alone, but by the King and his Witan. The Great Council of the Nation had its active share even in those branches of government which modern constitutional theories mark out as the special domain of the Executive. That laws were ordained, and taxes imposed,¹ by the authority of the Witan, that they sat as

Direct share of the Witan in every branch of government.

aliis præpolleret, pronius et promptius in electionem ejus est consentiendum"). The preamble is excellent, but the practical inference is strange, namely that Earl John, for his many virtues, should be chosen King. With this speech, made by, or attributed to, an English Archbishop we may compare the similar doctrine of elective monarchy laid down by a French Archbishop, Adalbero of Rheims, at the election of Hugh Capet in 987. "Non ignoramus Karolum fautores suos habere, qui eum dignum regno ex parentum collatione contendunt. Sed si de hoc agitur, nec regnum jure hereditario acquiritur, nec in regnum promovendus est nisi quem non solum corporis nobilitatis, sed et animi sapientia illustrat, fides munit, magnanimitas firmat. Legimus in annalibus clarissimi generis imperatoribus ignavia ab dignitate præcipitatis, alios modo pares, modo impares successisse." Richer, iv. 11.

¹ Taxation, in our modern sense, is seldom a matter of great importance in an early state of society. Public or demesne lands, various imposts on lands, feudal dues and compositions of various kinds, largely supply its place. Taxation in the modern sense is scarcely heard of in our early history, except for one shameful and unhappy purpose, that of buying off the Danish invaders. For this purpose a real tax, the famous Danegeld, was levied, and that, as appears by several passages of the Chronicles, by

CHAP. III. the highest Court for the trial of exalted and dangerous offenders, is only what we should look for from the analogy of modern times. It is more important to find that the King and his Witan, and not the King alone, concluded treaties, made grants of folkland, ordained the assemblage of fleets and armies, appointed and deposed the great officers of Church and State. Of the exercise of all these powers by the assembled Witan we shall find abundant examples in the course of this history. Now these are the very powers which a modern House of Commons shrinks from directly exercising. These are the powers which, under our present system, Parliament prefers to entrust to Ministers in whom it has confidence, whom it practically appoints, and whom it can practically dismiss without any formal ceremony of deposition. And, in our present state of things, little or no harm, and some direct good, comes from Parliament preferring an indirect course of action on these subjects. But, in an earlier state of things, a more direct agency of the Parliament or other National Assembly is absolutely necessary. The Assembly has to deal, not with a Ministry whom it can create and destroy without any formal action, but with a personal King, whom it has indeed elected and whom it can depose, but whose election and deposition are solemn national acts, his deposition indeed being the rarest and most extreme of all national acts. In such a state of things, the power of the King may be strictly limited by Law, but, within the limits which the Law prescribes to him, he acts according to his own will and pleasure, or according to the advice of counsellors who are purely of his own choosing. In such a state of things the King and the Nation are

Difference between the direct and indirect action of Parliament.

Direct action necessary in early times.

the combined authority of the King and his Witan. So, during the same unhappy reign of Æthelred, we shall find the King and his Witan laying on an impost, of which I shall speak more when I come to it in the course of my narrative, one of a kind intermediate between Ship-money and an Athenian *λειτουργία*.

brought face to face, and it is needful that the National Assembly should have a much more direct control over affairs than is at all needful when the ingenious device of a responsible Ministry is interposed between King and Parliament. Long after the days of our ancient Witenagemóts, in the days of Edward the Third for instance, Parliament was consulted about wars and negotiations in a much more direct way than it is now. It must not be thought that parliamentary control is really less effective in our time; it is merely that our present system makes it desirable that parliamentary control should be exercised in a more round-about way. Our present system avoids, above all things, all possibility of direct personal collision between Parliament and the Sovereign. But such direct personal collisions form the staple of English history from the thirteenth century onwards. In earlier times we have no record of the debates, but only of the determinations, of our National Councils. We therefore know not for certain how far such collisions commonly took place in early times.¹ The chance of them was perhaps less than it was some centuries later. The Plantagenet Kings had to deal with their Parliaments as with something external to themselves, something which laid petitions before them which they could accept or reject at pleasure. A struggle in those days was a struggle between the King and an united Parliament. Nowadays, as we all know, the struggle takes place within the walls of Parliament itself. But we can well believe that, in this respect, as in so many others, the earliest times were really more like

¹ There must have been a direct collision in the case of that "Good Parliament" of the eleventh century, the famous Mycel Gemót which restored Godwine and his family and drove out the foreign favourites of Eadward. But whether anybody voted against the enactment of the Laws of Æthelstan or Eadgar we have no means of knowing. We have several clear cases of parties among the Witan during a vacancy of the Crown; but that is not the present question.

CHAP. III. our own than the intermediate centuries were. An ancient Witenagemót did not petition, it decreed; it confirmed the acts of the King which, without the assent of the Witan, had no validity; it was not a body external to the King, but a body of which the King was the head in a much more direct sense than he could be said to be the head of a later mediæval Parliament. The King and his Witan acted together; the King could do nothing without the Witan, and the Witan could do nothing without the King; they were no external, half-hostile, body, but his own Council, surrounding and advising him. Direct collisions between the King on the one hand and an united Gemót on the other were not likely to be common. This is indeed mere conjecture, but it is a conjecture to which the phænomena of the case seem inevitably to lead us. But of the great powers of the Witenagemót, of its direct participation in all important acts of government, there can be no doubt at all. The fact is legibly written in every page of our early history.

Joint action of the King and the Witan.

The vast increase of the power of the Crown after the Norman Conquest, the introduction of a systematic feudal jurisprudence under the Angevin Kings, did much to lessen the authority and dignity of the National Councils. The idea of a nation and its chief, of a King and his counsellors, almost died away; the King became half despot, half mere feudal Lord. England was never without National Assemblies of some kind or other; but, from the Conquest in the eleventh century till the second birth of freedom in the thirteenth, they do not stand out in the same distinct and palpable shape in which they do both in earlier and in later times. Here again we owe our thanks to those illustrious worthies, from the authors of the Great Charter onwards, who, in so many ways, won back for us our ancient constitution in another shape. I have said that no political party can draw any

Diminution of parliamentary action after the Conquest.

The old freedom won back in the thirteenth century.

support for its own peculiar theories from that obscurest CHAP. III.
of subjects, the constitution of the Witenagemót. But
no lover of our old historic liberties can see without de-
light how venerable a thing those liberties are, how vast
and how ancient are the rights and powers of an English
Parliament. Our ancient Gemóts enjoyed every power of
a modern Parliament, together with some powers which
modern Parliaments shrink from claiming. Even such a
matter of detail as the special security granted to the per-
sons of members of the two Houses has been traced, and
not without a show of probability, to an enactment which
stands at the very front of English secular jurisprudence,
the second among the Laws ordained by our first Christian
King and the Witan of his Kingdom of Kent.¹

As the powers of the Witan were thus extensive, as the
King could do no important act of government without
their consent, some may hastily leap to the conclusion that
an ancient English King was a mere puppet in the hands
of the National Council. No inference could be more mis-
taken. Nothing is clearer in our early history than the
personal agency of the King in everything that is done,
and the unspeakable difference between a good and a bad
King. The truth is that in an early state of society
almost everything depends on the personal character of
the King. An able King is practically absolute; under
a weak King the government falls into utter anarchy
and chaos. Change the scene, as we shall presently do
in our narrative, from the days of Eadgar to those of
Æthelred; change it back again from the long, dreary,
hopeless reign of Æthelred to the few months of super-
human energy which form the reign of the hero Ead-

The King
not a pup-
pet in the
hands of
the Witan.

Vast im-
portance
of the
personal
character
of the
King.

¹ Laws of Æthelberht, Thorpe, i. 2. "Gif cyning his leode to him gehated,
and heom mon þær yfel gedo, II bote and cyninge L scillinga." (If King
his people to him call, and to them man there evil do, double damage and
to King fifty shillings.)

CHAP. III. mund; compare the nine months of Harold with the two months which followed his fall; and we shall see how the whole fate of the nation turned upon the personal character of its sovereign. With such witnesses before us, we can the better understand how our forefathers would have scouted the idea—if the idea had ever occurred to them—of jeopardizing the destiny of the nation on the accidents of strict hereditary succession, and how wisely they determined that the King must be, if not the worthiest of the nation, at any rate the worthiest of the royal house. The unhappy reign of Æthelred showed the bad side of even that limited application of the hereditary principle which was all that they admitted. Under her great Kings England had risen from her momentary overthrow to an Imperial dominion, a strong and united government at home, and a position formidable to every enemy. The accession of the minor son of Eadgar, a child who, except in his crimes and vices, seemed never to get beyond childhood, dragged down the glorious edifice into the dust. Thus much of good and of evil depended only on the personal character of the King. The King, it is true, could do nothing without his Witan, but, as his Witan could do nothing without him, he was not a shadow or a puppet, but a most important personal agent. He was no more a puppet than the Leader of the House of Commons is a puppet. We may be sure that the King and his immediate advisers had a practical initiative, and that the body of the Witan did little but accept or reject their proposals. We may be sure that a King fit for his place, an Ælfred or an Æthelstan, met with nothing that could be called opposition, but wielded the Assembly at his will. Princes invested with far smaller constitutional powers than those of an ancient English King have become the ruling spirits of commonwealths which denied them any sort of independent action. Agésilaios guided

Over-
whelming
personal
influence
of an able
King.

the policy of Sparta, and Francesco Foscari guided the policy of Venice,¹ with a personal influence almost as commanding as that which Periklês exercised in the pure Democracy of Athens or Aratos in the mixed constitution of the Achaian League. So, when a great King sat on the West-Saxon throne, we may be sure that, while every constitutional form was strictly observed,² the votes of the Witan were guided in everything by the will of the King. But when the King had no will, or a will which the Witan could not consent to, then of course the machine gave way, and nothing was to be seen but confusion and every evil work.³ Again, the King was not only the first mover, he was also the main doer, of everything. The Witan decreed, but it was the King who carried out their decrees. Weighty as was the influence of his personal character on the nature of the resolutions to be passed, its influence was weightier still on the way in which those resolutions were to be carried out. Under a good King counsel and execution went hand in hand; under a weak or wicked King there was no place found for either. Sometimes disgraceful resolutions were passed: sometimes wise and good resolutions were never carried into effect. The Witan under Æthelred sometimes voted money to buy off the Danes; sometimes they voted armies to fight against them; but, with Æthelred to carry out the decrees, it mattered little what the decrees were. Add to all this the enormous influence which attached to the King from his having all the chief men of the land bound to him by the personal tie of

CHAP. III.

Importance of the King as the Executive.

Influence of the King as Hlaford of all the chief men.

¹ See Oxford Essays, 1857, p. 155.

² On Ælfred's deference to the authority of his Witan, see the quotation from his Laws, above, p. 53.

³ The reign of Æthelred in England reminds one of the Generalship of Epéراتος in Achaia (Polyb. v. 30; Hist. of Fed. Gov. i. 550), but happily an Achaian General could not remain in office for thirty-eight years.

CHAP. III. Thegnship. He was the *Cyne-hlaford*, at once the King of the nation and the personal Lord of the individuals. Though his grants of folkland and his nominations to the highest offices required the assent of the Witan, yet, in these matters above all, his initiative would be undoubted; the Witan had only to confirm, and they would seldom be tempted to reject, the proposals which the King laid before them. He was not less the fountain of honour and the fountain of wealth, because, in the disposal of both, he had certain decent ceremonies to go through. Add to all this that, in unsettled times, there is a special chance, both of acts of actual oppression which the Law is not strong enough to redress, and of acts of energy beyond the Law which easily win popular condonation in the case of a victorious and beloved Monarch. Altogether, narrowly limited as were the legal powers of an ancient English King, his will, or lack of will, had the main influence on the destinies of the nation, and his personal character was of as much moment to the welfare of the state as the personal character of an absolute ruler.

General importance and influence of the King.

§ 4. *The Imperial power of the King and his relation to the Dependent Kingdoms.*

The King and his Witan then, in their joint action, formed the supreme legislature and the supreme tribunal of the English Kingdom. That Kingdom, from Æthelstan onwards, took in the whole Teutonic portion of Britain, together with those Celtic lands to the South-West, which had been incorporated and, to a great extent, Teutonized. This whole region, at least from the overthrow of the last Northumbrian King under Eadred, formed strictly one Kingdom; the revolt of the Mercians against Eadwig was only a momentary interruption of its unity. The

England strictly one Kingdom, but much local independence retained by the incorporated Kingdoms.

ancient divisions were indeed by no means forgotten; above all, the great Danish land beyond the Humber still retained a lively memory of its former independence. Both Northumberland and the other incorporated Kingdoms retained much of the form of distinct states; each retained its local Witenagemót, presided over by its local Ealdorman or Earl,¹ who exercised, by commission from the King and his Witan, full royal authority within his own province. But, as I have already explained, vast as were the powers of an ancient Ealdorman, he was still only a great magistrate, not a prince, even a dependent prince. The whole land formed one Kingdom under one King, and the King and his Witan possessed direct authority in every corner of it. But this Kingdom of the English was not the only title and dignity to which the house of Cerdic had attained. The King of the English was also Emperor of the whole Isle of Britain. I must now explain somewhat more at length the nature of this British Empire, as distinguished from the English

CHAP. III.
Superiority
or Empire
of the West-
Saxon
Kings over
all Britain.

¹ The older English meaning of the word *Eorl* has been already explained. The later special sense in which it is equivalent to *Ealdorman* came in with the Danes, whose leaders had always been called *Jarls*. The governor of Northumberland, after the incorporation under Eadred, certainly bore the Danish title. Urm, Andcol, Uhtred (the ancestor of a long line of Northumbrian Earls), Grim, and Scule, all seemingly Northumbrian chiefs, sign a charter of Eadred's in 949 (Cod. Dipl. ii. 292) with the title of *Eorl*. The same title is applied to Oslac both in the Chronicles (975, "*Oslac se mæra Eorl*") and in the laws of Eadgar (Thorpe, i. 278), where the *Earl* Oslac seems to be pointedly distinguished from the *Ealdormen* Ælfhere of Mercia and Æthelwine of East-Anglia. When the word *Eorl* is found in this sense in the Chronicles at an earlier date, it is always a sign of later insertion. (See Earle, p. 38.) Whether the title was in use throughout the Denalagu is less clear. Brihtnoth is called *Eorl* in the poem of Maldon; but this may be a poetical use. On the other hand the Chronicles constantly speak of *Ealdormen*, even in Danish districts like Lindesey; but this may be an accommodation to Southern language. In the purely Saxon districts there can be no doubt that the ancient title of *Ealdorman* went on uninterruptedly, till, under Cnut, *Eorl* supplanted it everywhere.

CHAP. III. Kingdom, which was only part of it. In this inquiry two special points call for notice. There is, first, the fact that the English Kings did exercise a superiority of some kind over the whole of Britain, a fact which has sometimes been called in question by local prejudice. There is, secondly, the question as to the exact nature of that superiority, and as to the motives which led the Kings of the tenth and eleventh centuries to assume distinctively Imperial titles. It must not be forgotten that in those days such titles were not assumed at random: the idea of the Roman Empire was still thoroughly understood, and indeed the Roman Empire itself, both in the East and in the West, was in one of its most flourishing periods.

Statement of the question.

First, the fact of the superiority. Second, the force of the assumption of strictly Imperial titles.

The fact that the West-Saxon or English Kings, from Eadward the Elder onwards, did exercise an external supremacy over the Celtic princes of the island is a fact too clear to be misunderstood by any one who looks the evidence on the matter fairly in the face. I date this supremacy, in the case of Scotland, from the reign of Eadward the Elder, because there is no certain earlier instance of submission on the part of the Scots to any West-Saxon King. I pass by the instances of Scottish submission to several of the earlier Northumbrian Kings, as well as what looks very like a submission of both Scots and Northumbrians to the Roman Empire itself in the person of Charles the Great.¹ These instances do not prove the existence of any permanent superiority; they are rather analogous to the temporary and fluctuating superiority of this or that Bretwalda over the other English Kingdoms. But, from the time of Eadward the Elder onwards, the case is perfectly clear. The submission of Wales dates from the time of Ecgberht; but it evidently received a more distinct and formal acknowledgement in the reign of Eadward.

Superiority over Scotland dates from Eadward the Elder. 924. No earlier supremacy in Wessex.

Submission of Wales to Ecgberht, 828; to Eadward, 922.

¹ See above, p. 40.

Two years before the *Commendation* of Scotland, all the Kings and people of Wales *commended* themselves to the West-Saxon King; "they sought him to Lord."¹ So, in the accounts of the transactions both with Scotland and with Strathclyde, it is stated with equal clearness that the people of both those countries had a share in the acts of their princes by which Eadward was chosen to Father and to Lord.² I conceive this to mean that the Scottish and Welsh princes acted in this matter by the consent and authority of whatever body in their own states answered to the Witan in England. The Commendation in both cases was a solemn national act. For the motive of the act I have already suggested a sufficient reason in fear of Eadward's power, combined with a sense of the necessity of common action with him against the heathen invaders who ravaged all parts of Britain alike. I use the feudal word *Commendation*, because that word seems to me better than any other to express the real state of the case. The transaction between Eadward and the Celtic princes was simply an application, on an international scale, of the general principle of the *Comitatus*. That relation, like all the feudal relations which it helped to form, may be contracted either on the greatest or on the smallest scale possible. The land which either is originally granted out on a military tenure, or which its allodial owner finds it expedient to convert into a fief so held, may be a Kingdom or it may be a rood of land maintaining its man. So the Lord whom a man chooses, and the man who chooses the Lord, may be of

CHAP. III.

The Welsh and Scottish people concur with their princes in the Commendation.

Nature of Commendation;

the relation unaffected by greatness or smallness of scale.

¹ Chron. 922. "And þa cyningas on Norþ Wealum, Howel and Cleddau and Ieopwel, and eall Norþ Weallcyn hine sohton him to hlaforde." North Wales, it must be remembered, does not mean Caernarvon as opposed to Glamorgan, but *Wales* as opposed to Cornwall.

² Chron. 924. "And hine geces þa to fæder and to hlaforde Scotta cyning and eall Scotta þeod . . . and eac Stræcled Weala cyning and ealle Stræcled Wealas."

CHAP. III. any possible rank, from the Emperor and the Pope with their vassal Kings down to the smallest Thegn and his neighbouring Ceorl.¹ The relation is exactly the same, whatever may be the rank and power of the parties between whom it is contracted. In every case alike, faithful service is owing on the one side and faithful protection on the other. Equally in the greatest case and in the smallest, the relation may imply a strictly feudal tenure of land or it may not. Now, in recording these cases of Welsh and Scottish submission, it will be observed that the Chronicles, as if of set purpose, make use of the familiar legal phrases which express the relation of Commendation on the smaller scale. A man "chose his Lord;" he sought some one more powerful

Process of
Commen-
dation on a
small scale.

than himself, with whom he entered into the relation of *Comitatus*; as feudal ideas strengthened, he commonly surrendered his allodial land to the Lord so chosen, and received it back again from him on a feudal tenure. This was the process of Commendation, a process of everyday occurrence in the case of private men choosing their Lords, whether those Lords were simple gentlemen or Kings. And the process was equally familiar among sovereign princes themselves. Almost all the Northern and Eastern vassals of the Western Empire, some of them of kingly rank,² became vassals by Commendation. The Commendation was doubtless in many cases far from voluntary, but the legal form was always the same. The lands of these princes were not original grants from the

Instances
of Com-
mendation
among
Sovereign
Princes.

¹ I am not clear that even a Ceorl might not himself be a *Hlaford* to a poorer Ceorl. A Ceorl might have his own *Loaf-eaters* (*Hlaf-etas*. Laws of Æthelberht, 25), which looks very like a form of the *Comitatus*.

² Among a crowd of smaller princes the Kings of Denmark, Poland, Hungary, and Bohemia stand out conspicuous. All these were, at one time or another, vassals of the Empire, though all, except Bohemia, recovered their independence. The Kings of Poland and Bohemia received the royal title on an Imperial grant.

Emperors; but their owners found it expedient to come to terms with their Imperial neighbour, and to place themselves and their lands in the same position as if their lands had been real Imperial grants. We might go on to say that the Norman conquerors of Southern Italy commended themselves to the Pope whom they took prisoner, and that the Sicilian Kingdoms, on the strength of that commendation, remained for seven hundred years in the position of fiefs of the Holy See. The Kingdom of England was, certainly once, possibly twice, commended to a foreign potentate. John, as all the world knows, commended his Kingdom to the Pope; and it is by no means clear that his brother Richard had not before that commended it to the Emperor.¹ There was nothing unusual or degrading in the relation; if Scotland, Wales, Strathclyde, commended themselves to the West-Saxon King, they only put themselves in the same relation to their powerful neighbour in which every continental prince stood in theory, and most of them in actual fact, to the Emperor, Lord of the World. Not to speak of a crowd of smaller instances, Odo, King of the West-Franks, commended himself to Arnulf of Germany, just as Howel and Constantine commended themselves to Eadward of Wessex. And this commendation was made before Arnulf became Emperor and Lord of the World, while he was still the simple King of the Eastern Franks.² The Commendation in the case of Scotland and Strathclyde was, in form at least, a perfectly voluntary act, done with the full consent of the nations in-

CHAP. III.

Commendation of the Normans to Leo the Ninth. 1053.

Commendation of England to the Pope by John; [1213.]

perhaps to the Emperor by Richard. 1193.

Homage of Odo the West-Frank to Arnulf. 888.

¹ Richard did homage to Henry the Sixth for *some* Kingdom, and was accordingly enrolled among the Princes of the Empire. But it is not clear whether the homage was done for the Kingdom of England or for an imaginary Kingdom of Provence.

² Widukind, i. 29, who however calls him Imperator prospectively. The date is fixed by the Annales Vedastini (Pertz, i. 525, ii. 205), though they give a different colouring to the transaction.

CHAP. III.

Relations
between
England
and Scot-
land as
friendly as
was usual
in such
cases.

The claims
of Edward
Planta-
genet in
1291 rest
on the
Commenda-
tion to
Eadward
the Elder
in 924.

Change of
ideas in
the mean-
while.

terested. The Kingdom of Strathclyde soon came to an end, and with the Welsh of Wales proper no permanent relations of any kind could be kept up. But between the English over-lord and his Scottish vassal the mutual compact was perhaps as well kept as it ever was in such cases. It was occasionally broken and occasionally renewed; but this was no more than happened always and everywhere in those turbulent times. The relations between the English *Basileus* and the King of Scots may on the whole be called friendly; they were at least much more friendly than the relations which existed between the King of the West-Franks and his dangerous vassal at Rouen. The original Commendation to the Eadward of the tenth century, confirmed by a series of acts of submission spread over the whole of the intermediate time, is the true justification for the acts of his glorious namesake in the thirteenth century.¹ The only difference was that, during that time, feudal notions had greatly developed on both sides; the original Commendation of the Scottish King and people to a Lord, had changed, in the ideas of both sides, into a feudal tenure of the land of the Scottish Kingdom. But this change was simply the universal change which had come over all such relations everywhere. That this point, the only point which could with any justice have been raised against Edward Plantagenet on the Scottish side, never was brought forward shows how completely the ancient notion of Commendation had gone out of mind.² But the principal point at issue, the right of the over-lord to

¹ See Edward's own statement, tracing his right up to the Commendation, in Trivet (p. 382, Hog) and Hemingford (ii. 196). It is a pity that the nonsense about Brutus has found its way into some copies of these documents.

² A Highlander, with his notions (though grounded on a somewhat different principle) of personal fidelity to a chief, might perhaps have understood it; but the true Scots had very little to do with the affairs of the Kingdom of Scotland.

decide between two claimants of the vassal Kingdom, rested on excellent precedents in the reigns of Eadward the Confessor and of William Rufus. Altogether the vassalage—to use the most convenient word—of Scotland from the Commendation to Eadward to the treaty of Northampton is one of the best authenticated facts in history. But it is here needful to point out two other distinct events which have often been confounded with the Commendation of Scotland, a confusion through which the real state of the case has often been misunderstood. In the eleventh century at least, if not in the tenth, the King of Scots stood to his English over-lord in a threefold relation, grounded on three distinct acts which are popularly confounded. In this matter, as in so many others, prevalent ignorance is strengthened by inattention to historical geography. As it is hard to make people understand that there has not always been a Kingdom of France including Marseilles and Strassburg, perhaps even including Nizza and Chambery, so it is hard to make people understand that there have not always been Kingdoms of England and Scotland, with the Tweed and the Cheviot Hills as the boundaries between them. It must be borne in mind that, in the tenth century, no such boundaries existed, and that the names of England and Scotland, as geographical terms, were hardly known. At the time of the Commendation the country which is now called Scotland was divided among three quite distinct sovereignties. North of the Forth and Clyde reigned the King of Scots, an independent Celtic prince, reigning over a Celtic people, the Picts and Scots, the exact relation between which two tribes is a matter of perfect indifference to my present purpose. South of the two great firths, the Scottish name and dominion was unknown. The south-west part of modern Scotland formed part of the Kingdom of the Strathclyde

CHAP. III.

924-1328.

Threefold
relation of
the King
of Scots to
the Eng-
lish Crown.

Geography
of Scot-
land,
Strath-
clyde, and
Lothian in
the tenth
century.

CHAP. III. Welsh, which, up to 924, was, like the Kingdom of the
 Relations of the three to one another and to the English Crown. Scots, an independent Celtic principality. The south-eastern part of modern Scotland, Lothian in the wide sense of the word, was purely English or Danish, as in language it remains to this day. It was part of the Kingdom of Northumberland, and it had its share in all the revolutions of that Kingdom. In the year 924 Lothian was ruled by the Danish Kings of Northumberland, subject only to that precarious superiority on the part of Wessex which had been handed on from Ecgberht and Ælfred. In the year 924, when the three Kingdoms, Scotland, Strathclyde, and Northumberland, all commended themselves to Eadward, the relation was something new on the part of Scotland and Strathclyde; but on the part of Lothian, as an integral part of Northumberland, it was only a renewal of the relation which had been formerly entered into with Ecgberht and Ælfred. It is not uncommon to hear the vassalage of Scotland proper, that is, the land north of the Forth and Clyde, mixed up with questions about Cumberland and Lothian. But though these two countries soon afterwards came to have a close relation with Scotland, they stood, at the time of the Commendation of 924, in no relation at all to Scotland except that of simple, most likely not very friendly, neighbourhood. The transactions which brought Scotland, Strathclyde, and Lothian into their relations to one another and to the English Crown were quite distinct from each other. They were as follows:—

First, The Commendation of the King and people of the Scots to Eadward in 924.

Secondly, The Grant of Cumberland by Eadmund to Malcolm in 945.

Thirdly, The Grant of Lothian to the Scottish Kings, either by Eadgar or by Cnut.

These three events are perfectly distinct, and the rela-

tions created by them are perfectly distinct; only, as always happens when several relations and tenures co-exist, the three gradually got confounded together, both in idea and in fact. Both in popular conception and in the hands of partizan Scottish writers, the second of these three events is made to obscure the other two. The grant by an English King to a Scottish King of a country described as Cumberland is something too clear to be denied; that the Scottish princes held their Cumbrian dominions as a fief of the English Crown, and did homage for them to the English King, no Scottish writer has ever ventured to call in doubt.¹ In truth there seems never to have been any wish to call this fact in doubt, because the Cumbrian homage, put forth sometimes even in an exaggerated shape, has formed a convenient means of escape from the fact of the homage for Scotland proper and from the fact of the purely English character of Lothian. And the confusion of geographical terms comes conveniently in. In modern language Cumberland means a single shire, which for ages has been undoubtedly English. In modern language Lothian means three shires, which for ages have been

CHAP. III.

Popular
confusions;
true na-
ture of the
grant of
Cumber-
land.

¹ On the whole history of Strathclyde and the Cumbrian cession see Palgrave, *English Commonwealth*, i. 440 et seqq.

The fact of the grant is admitted even in the book called "*Extracta ex Croniciis Scocie*," pp. 49, 50, though the compiler vigorously asserts a former Scottish possession lost by the Scottish defeat at Brunanburh. Of King Gregory (875-892) we read (p. 46), "*Hic etiam strenue totam subjugavit Hiberniam et pæne totam Angliam.*" Of Constantine (p. 47), "*Hic rex xl annis regnavit, et quamvis contra eum bellabant reges Anglorum, Eadwīnus [sic] et filius suus nothus Adelstanus successive regnantes, et contra Scotos cum Danis pactum et pacem inierunt, qui post iv annos rumpitur et Angli à Scotis veniam precantes, iterum Scotos sibi reconciliarunt. Quo toto tempore Rex Constantinus Cumbriam et ceteras terras in Anglia possedit, et regni sui anno xvi dedit Eugenio filio Dovenaldi sperato successorī dimidium regni Cumbri hereditari possidendam.*"

He cannot escape all mention of Brunanburh;—"Infaustus ille dies Scotis, nam quæque dominia temporibus Gregorii et hactenus conquesta, necnon liv annis possessa, quidam scribunt Constantinum Regem hoc bello perdidisse."

CHAP. III. undoubtedly Scottish. People are thus led to believe that Lothian was, from all time, an integral part of Scotland, and also that the homage done by the Scottish to the English King was done only for the county of Cumberland as an integral part of England. But, in the language of the year 945, Lothian was still an integral portion of England; Cumberland meant a country, part of which is now English and part Scottish, but which up to that time was neither English nor Scottish, but the seat of a distinct Welsh principality. By Cumberland in short is meant, not merely the modern English county so called, but all Northern Strathclyde; that is, modern Cumberland together with a considerable portion of modern Scotland. Between the two dates of 924 and 945, members of the Scottish royal family had begun to reign in Strathclyde or Cumberland; but the Kingdom was still quite distinct from Scotland. In 945 the reigning King Donald revolted against his over-lord Eadmund; he was overthrown and his Kingdom ravaged;¹ it was then granted on tenure of military service² to his kinsman Malcolm King of

Circumstances of the grant of Cumberland or Strathclyde.

¹ The Chronicles (945) merely mention the harrying of Cumberland and the grant to Malcolm. Fordun (iv. 24) mentions the grant and the homage in the most explicit language, but he does not fully explain the immediately preceding circumstances (cf. cap. 21). Henry of Huntingdon talks vaguely about the perfidy of the Cumbrians. Roger of Wendover adds that Llwelyn of Dyfed aided (as indeed he was bound to do) Eadmund in the Cumbrian war, and tells us that the two sons of Donald (or Dummail) were blinded by Eadmund. The important point is the grant, on which all agree.

² Chron. 945. "Hit let eall to Malculme Scotta cinge, on þæt gerád þæt he wære his midwyrhta ægþer ge on sæ ge on lande." Fordun is the most explicit of all, though he uses more distinctly feudal language. "Provinciam, quæ vocatur Cumbreland, Regi Scotorum Malcolmo, Rex sub fidelitate jurisjurandi commendavit, hæc ille. Postmodum vero statim inter eos concordatum est, et amborum consilio decretum, ut in futurum, pro bono continuandæ pacis utriusque regni, Malcolmi Regis proximus hæres Indulfus, cæterorumque Regum Scotorum hæredes, qui pro tempore fuerunt, Edmundo Regi, suisque successoribus Anglis Regibus homagium pro Cumbria facerent, et fidelitates Sacramentum." He goes on to say that

Scots. Malcolm could hardly have earned this favour except by sharing in the war against his kinsman, which indeed his actual relation to the English Crown bound him to do. Anyhow he thus came into possession of the land between Morecambe Bay and the Firth of Clyde, a country now partly English and partly Scottish, holding it by direct grant from the English Crown. For a long time, as I have before said, the fief was granted out again by the Scottish Kings as an apanage for their own heirs-apparent. The southern part of this territory was afterwards, as we shall see at a later stage of our history, annexed to England; the northern part was retained by the Scottish Kings, and was gradually, though very gradually, incorporated with their own Kingdom. The distinction between the two states seems to have been quite forgotten in the thirteenth century; neither side drew any distinction between the tenure of Fife and the tenure of Galloway; the claims of the English Crown were asserted, admitted, or denied, equally with regard to both. Yet the relations between England and Scotland proper, and the relations between England and Strathclyde or Cumberland, though much the same in their nature, were wholly different in their origin. The relation in which Scotland stood to England was one of Commendation; the relation in which Cumberland stood to England was one of original grant. This last fact marks a distinct advance in feudal ideas. Cumberland was, from the beginning, a real territorial fief. Eadward did not grant Scotland to Constantine, because Scotland had never been his; but Constantine and his people, by their own act, put themselves in the same position as if it had been so granted. But Eadmund really did grant Cum-

The portion retained by Scotland becomes merged in the Scottish Kingdom.

Original distinction between the position of Strathclyde or Cumberland, and the position of Scotland proper.

neither King was ever to take the Cumbrians, "*barbaram aquilonis et perfidam gentem*," into their direct favour or homage, a promise afterwards broken on both sides.

CHAP. III. berland to Malcolm; he granted him a territory which he had himself conquered, and which he might have kept in his own hands. Cumberland, in short—including, as must not be forgotten, the south-western shires of modern Scotland—was held by the Scottish King or his son as a feudal benefice in the strictest sense.

Grant of
Lothian.

Cumberland then was truly a fief of the Crown of England, but it was not a fief held within the Kingdom of England. This last position, popularly thought to be the position of Cumberland, was really the position of Lothian. The date of the grant of Lothian is not perfectly clear.¹ But,

Lothian
an integral
part of
England.

whatever was the date, as to the nature of the grant there can be no doubt at all. Lothian, an integral part of England, could be granted only as any other part of England could be granted, namely to be held as part of England, its ruler being in the position of an English Earl. If the grant was really made by Eadgar, this is still more likely to be the case, on account of the unusual friendliness of the relations between Eadgar and Kenneth. Eadgar might well grant, and Kenneth might well accept, a purely English government, held by a tenure which would bind him still more closely to his English over-lord than either his commendatory relation for Scotland or his feudal relation for Strathclyde. In such a grant, no doubt, the seeds of separation were sown. A part of the Kingdom which was governed by a foreign sovereign, on whatever terms of dependence, could not long remain in the position of a province governed by an ordinary Earl. The King of Scots, though holding all his dominions by various kinds of dependent tenure, could not be dealt with in any portion of them like a simple Earl of the Northum-

Lothian
gradually
separated
from Eng-
land and
merged in
Scotland.

¹ The evidence is so contradictory that I reserve its consideration for an Appendix. See Appendix B.

² For the history of Lothian, see Palgrave, *English Commonwealth*, i. 475, et seqq.

brians. That the possession of Lothian would be, under all ordinary circumstances, hereditary, must have been looked for from the beginning. This alone would distinguish Lothian from all other Earldoms. Though it was very common to appoint the son of a deceased Ealdorman to his father's dignity, still he had not so much as a preferential claim; the office was held altogether at the pleasure of the King and his Witan. But when a province was once granted to a foreign prince, even though that prince remained a feudatory of the English Crown, this sort of control was parted with for ever, or could be recovered only at the cost of war. It was unavoidable that Lothian should become an hereditary dominion of the Scottish Kings; it was almost unavoidable that it should gradually lose its distinct character and the remembrance of its distinct tenure, and should be gradually merged in the mass of their other dominions. By the time of the great controversy of the thirteenth century the distinction seems to have been forgotten on both sides, exactly as it was in the case of Strathclyde. The claims of the English King were alike over the whole country, over Scotland, Strathclyde, and Lothian; they were put forward as a whole and they were accepted or rejected as a whole. Yet, when we weigh the claims of Edward Plantagenet by the letter of the compacts of the tenth century, if we pronounce them to go a little beyond the mark in the case of Scotland proper, we must equally pronounce them to fall a little under the mark in the case of Lothian. The fact is that the progress of feudal ideas had obliterated the distinction, and had brought both tenures to the same level. The alternative by that time had come to be whether Scotland, as a whole, that is, Scotland proper, Scottish Strathclyde, and Lothian, should be a fief of England or an independent Kingdom. That Scotland, Strathclyde, and Lothian were, historically, all dependencies

CHAP. III.

Distinction
between
Scotland,
Strath-
clyde, and
Lothian
gradually
forgotten.

CHAP. III. of England, but held in three different degrees of dependence, had passed out of mind on both sides.

Later history of Lothian.

Lothian becomes the historical Scotland.

It was then to be expected that Lothian, when once granted to the King of Scots, should gradually be merged in the Kingdom of Scotland. But the peculiar and singular destiny of this country could hardly have been looked for. Neither Eadgar nor Kenneth could dream that this purely English or Danish province would become the historical Scotland. The different tenures of Scotland and Lothian got confounded; the Kings of Scots, from the end of the eleventh century, became English in manners and language; they were not without some pretensions and some hopes of winning the Crown of England for themselves; they learned to attach more and more value to the English part of their dominions, and they laboured to spread its language and manners over their original Celtic territory. They retained their ancient title of Kings of Scots, but they became in truth Kings of English Lothian and of Anglicized Fife. A state was thus formed, politically distinct from England, and which political circumstances gradually made bitterly hostile to England; a state which indeed retained a dark and mysterious Celtic background, but which, as it appears in history, is English in laws, language, and manners, more truly English indeed, in many respects, than England itself remained after the Norman Conquest. As in so many other cases, the people took the name of their sovereign; the English subjects of the King of Scots learned to call themselves Scots and their country Scotland. Meanwhile the true Scots to the north of them, the original subjects of the Scottish dynasty, forsaken as it were by their natural princes, became the standing difficulty of their government. The true Scots are known in history only as a mass of turbulent tribes, alien in customs, language, and feeling from those who had as-

sumed their name—tribes which the Kings of Dunfermline and Edinburgh had much ado to keep in even nominal

subjection. The history of Scotland is in many respects strikingly analogous to the history of Switzerland. I pass by the singular likeness in the national character of the two peoples, a likeness to be traced alike in the virtues and in the defects of each. I speak only of the outward facts of their history. In the case of Switzerland, portions

CHAP. III.
Analogy
between
the history
of Scotland
and of
Switzer-
land.

of the German, Burgundian, and Italian nations were, through a variety of political causes, detached from the main body of their respective countrymen, and became united by a close political tie to one another. They thus formed an artificial nation,¹ a political and historical nation, but not a nation of common blood and speech. In the case

Their posi-
tion as
artificial
nations.

of Scotland, portions of the English, Welsh, and Irish² nations were in like manner detached from the main body of their own people; they became in the same way politically connected, and formed in the same way an artificial nation. In both cases it is sometimes amusing to hear men claim as their forefathers those who were the bitterest enemies of their real forefathers. But in both cases it is more important to mark, what the history both of Switzerland and of Scotland abundantly proves, that an artificial nation of this kind is capable of as true and honourable national feeling as any nation of the most unmixed blood and language. The history both of Switzerland and of Scotland presents so many materials for honest pride that it is a pity that exaggerations and perversions of history should have ever been allowed to step in in either case. And, to cite one point more of likeness, each people has drawn its national name from a very small portion of its territory and population. Switzerland, German, Bur-

¹ See History of Federal Government, i. 120.

² Again I keep clear of all mazes about Picts and Scots. My division is true upon any theory, except the wild one of Pinkerton. The Picts were either Irish or Welsh—in the wide sense of those two words.

CHAP. III. gundian, and Italian, has derived its common name from the single small Canton of Schwyz. Scotland, English, Welsh, and Gaelic, has derived its common name from the original small colony of Irish Scots who settled on the coast of Argyllshire.

Case of
Wales ana-
logous to
that of
Scotland.

I have dwelt on the Scottish question at length, both because of its intrinsic importance, and because the relations between the Crowns of England and Scotland will be constantly demanding notice in the course of our history. The case with regard to Wales is the case of Scotland over again. The homage of the Welsh Kings was always due, and was constantly exacted, from the days of Ecgberht and Eadward onwards. The only difference was in the final result. Wales was incorporated with the English Kingdom at the close of the thirteenth century; Scotland obtained perfect independence in the fourteenth. The life of one man made all the difference. The Great Edward lived thoroughly to secure his Welsh conquest; before he had thoroughly secured his Scottish conquest, his mission had passed to a son who could not keep his crown on his head at home.

1283.

1328.

Before we leave this subject, it may be well to remember what the relations between a dependent Kingdom and its superior Lord really were. The King of the English did not, by virtue of the Commendation, claim any jurisdiction within the dominions of his vassals.¹ The individual in-

¹ The final quarrel between Edward the First and John of Balliol arose on a question which looks very like a claim on the part of the King of England to jurisdiction in internal Scottish affairs. That is to say, Edward the First, as feudal superior, received appeals from the Courts of the Kingdom of Scotland, exactly as the King of the French, Edward's own feudal superior for the Duchy of Aquitaine, received appeals from Edward's Courts in that Duchy. We can hardly suppose that any such right was contemplated in the original Commendation; it is a notion essentially belonging to a later time. But it was no arbitrary invention of Edward's; he did but receive the appeals which Scottish suitors brought before him of their own accord.

habitant of Scotland stood in no relation to the suzerain King.¹ The relation was a purely international one. The King and people of the Scots chose the King of the English as their Father and Lord; it became his duty to protect them against their enemies, and it became their duty to serve him against his enemies. But with the internal management of the Scottish Kingdom he had no concern, nor did this or that individual Scot become his "man" or his subject. Such was the relation; as we go on, we shall see its engagements broken on both sides. We shall find the Scottish vassal more than once breaking through his obligation of fidelity, and we shall, once at least, find the English over-lord of Strathclyde breaking through his obligation of protection, setting up an unjust claim to a tribute which was not imposed by the original grant, and cruelly devastating the country in revenge for a perfectly justifiable refusal of his demands.² But such breaches of duty on both sides are in no way peculiar to England and Scotland; they form a very large portion of the history of any two countries between which such relations existed. The truth is that the feudal or commendatory relation is a very delicate one, offering constant temptations to a breach of its duties on both

The relation between Scotland and England international only.

The relation often broken on both sides.

1000.

Delicate nature of the relation.

The truth is that, when the commendatory relation had, in the ideas of both sides, changed into a strictly feudal one, the right of appeal would seem to follow as a matter of course, and no one would stop to ask whether it was really implied in the ancient Commendation.

¹ The fact that the people, as well as the King, chose Eadward as their Lord does not seem to me to imply that he became Lord to each particular man. In cases where the relation was much closer than between Scotland and England, the *arrière* vassal was not the *man* of the over-lord. Thus John of Joinville, as a vassal of the Count of Champagne, refused to do homage to the King of the French, because he was not his *man*. When Henry the Second exacted an oath of fealty from the vassals of William the Lion, the claim was a novelty, and it was given up by Richard the First, a renunciation which has been perverted into a renunciation of all superiority over Scotland.

² I refer to the transactions between Æthelred and Malcolm of Cumberland, which I shall speak of in my fifth Chapter.

CHAP. III.

Analogy
with colo-
nial rela-
tions.

Attend-
ance of the
Welsh and
Scottish
Princes in
the Wite-
nagemót.

sides, temptations which, in a rude age, must often have been irresistible. The relation is not identical with the modern relation between the Mother Country and its colonies and dependencies, but there are many points of analogy between the two. And we all know well how very delicate the relation always is between the Metropolis and its colony. But the point to be borne in mind is that the English over-lord of Scotland, Strathclyde, and Wales claimed no sovereignty within those countries, but only a superiority over them. He claimed such a superiority as the King of the French exercised, or claimed to exercise, over the Duke of the Normans. The relation was less close than the relation between the Emperor and the German Princes, as no common Diet looked after the common interests of all. That the Scottish and Welsh princes had the right, which they most likely deemed a burthen, of attending the meetings of the English Witan is certain; it is equally certain that the attendance of the Scottish and Cumbrian princes was exceedingly rare.¹ And at any rate they must have come only in their personal capacity, to transact any business which they might have with their over-lord and his coun-

¹ The attendance of the Welsh Kings is not uncommon, especially in the reign of Æthelstan. They often sign Charters with the titles of *Subregulus* or *under-Cyning*. See the signatures, ranging from 930 to 956 (Cod. Dipl. ii. 170, 173, 193, 196, 203, 292, 304, 326, 412, v. 199, 206, 215) of the *Subreguli* Howel, Morcant, Owen, Juthwal, Tudor, Syferth, Jacob, Jukil, and Wurgeat. The Cumbrian signatures are rarer, but we have those of Eugenius in 931 (v. 199), and Malcolm in 966 and 970 (ii. 413, iii. 59). The signature of Kenneth of Scotland is attached to three Charters (Cod. Dipl. ii. 413, iii. 67. Palgrave ccli., cclii.), but the authenticity of all three has been suspected. His presence however at the great ceremony at Chester shows that the appearance of the King of Scots in the Witenagemót was a thing that might be looked for. The treaty between Richard the First and William the Lion, by which the novel claims of Henry the Second were given up, contains elaborate rules for the reception of the King of Scots on his way to the King's Court as due of ancient custom. (Palgrave, cccxxxix.)

sellors. We cannot suppose that the English Gemót was ever attended by any Scottish or Welsh Witan beyond the immediate suite of the Scottish and Welsh Kings. We cannot suppose that the English Gemót assumed to make laws for Wales or Scotland. Neither can we suppose that the Welsh and Scottish Princes, though they sign the acts of the Gemóts at which they were present, took any active share or interest in purely English affairs.

The King of the English was thus suzerain lord or external superior of all the princes of the Isle of Britain. In that character, from the days of Æthelstan onwards, our Kings assumed titles beyond those of ordinary royalty, titles which, in strictness, belonged only to the successors of Charles and of Constantine. They appear in their public acts as *Basileus, Caesar, Imperator, Imperator Augustus*.¹ Several questions at once arise. Are these titles mere outpourings of vanity, mere pieces of inflated rhetoric, mere specimens of the turgid style of the tenth century? Or do they imply a serious claim on the part of the English Kings to be looked on as something more than mere Kings, to be deemed the peers of the Lords of Imperial Rome, Old and New? And, if they do imply such a claim, from what was that claim understood to be derived? Did the Emperors of Britain in the tenth century inherit, or claim to inherit, their Imperial rank from the provincial Emperors who reigned in

CHAP. III.

Statement
of the case
as to the
Imperial
titles.1st. Are
they to be
taken as
seriously
implying
Imperial
claims?2nd. If so,
are they to
be traced
uninter-
ruptedly
to the old
provincial
Emperors?

¹ I reserve specimens of these titles for an Appendix (C). I will here quote one only, of the year 955, one which is perhaps the most singular of all, and which is the only one in which I have found the word *Cæsar* in any shape. The language is a strange jumble of Greek, Latin, and English. "En onomatos cyrion doxa. Al wísdóm ge for Gode ge for werolde is gestaðelad on ðeám hefonlícan goldhorde almæhtiges Godes per Jesum Christum, cooperante gratiâ Spiritûs Sancti. He hafað geweorðad mid cynedóme Angulseaxna Eáðred *cyning and cæsere tottus Britanníæ* Deo gratias for ðem weolegað and árað gehádade and læwede ða ðe mid rihte magon geærnian." &c., &c. Cod. Dipl. ii. 303.

CHAP. III. Britain in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries? Are we to trace an uninterrupted succession of Imperial sovereignty, from Carausius onwards, through Maximus, Constantine,¹ Aurelius Ambrosius, and the eight Bretwaldas, down to the *Imperatores* and *Basileis* of the days succeeding the Com-

3rd. Or are they borrowed from the style of the contemporary Emperors, through a feeling that the position of the English King was an Imperial one? mendations of Scotland, Wales, and Strathclyde? Or are we to see in these titles merely an imitation of the style of the contemporary Roman Emperors, Eastern and Western; an imitation indeed not grounded solely on a love of sounding titles, but on a feeling that the English sovereignty was in some sort greater than that of ordinary Kings, that it had something in common with that of the Emperors, that, in short, the King of the English held in his own island a position answering to that which the Emperor of the Romans held in the rest of the world?

The third alternative the true one.

These questions have given rise to a large amount of controversy. My own belief, briefly to sum it up, is that vanity and the love of sounding titles may well have had some secondary share in the matter, but yet that these titles were seriously meant as a distinct assertion of the Imperial position of the English Crown. But I do not believe that there was the least thought of any succession from the ancient provincial Emperors, or from any phantom of Imperial sovereignty which may have lingered on among the Welsh at the time of the English Conquest or afterwards. I believe that these titles were assumed in order at once to claim for the English Crown an absolute independence of the Roman Empire, and to assert its right to the same sort of superiority over all the princes of Britain as the Emperor exercised, or claimed to exercise, over all the princes of the Continent. I believe, in short, that, as the Metropolitan of England was sometimes called *alterius orbis Apostolicus*,² so the King of the English claimed,

¹ Not of course Constantine the Great, but Constantine the "Tyrant" of the fourth century.

² Eadmer, Vit. Ans. ii. c. 4. "Quumque illum [Anselmum] . . . quasi

though I do not find the exact words used, to be *alterius orbis Imperator*. I will now go on to give the reasons for the conclusion to which I have come.¹

It is undoubtedly true that the Latin Charters of our Kings during the latter half of the tenth century are the most turgid and absurd of all human compositions. No-thing is said straightforwardly; no idea is expressed by the word which would most naturally occur to express it. The Latin language is ransacked for strange and out of the way terms; and, when Latin fails, the writers draw on whatever store of Greek they enjoyed. They turn the whole into a piebald or mongrel language, something like the jargon of Dutch ambassadors or of English lawyers in the seventeenth century.² When such a taste prevailed, it was no wonder that the titles of King, Ealdorman, and Bishop were thought not grand enough, and that the dignitaries of Church and State were de-

Turgid
style of
the Latin
Charters of
the tenth
century.

comparem vel ut alterius orbis Apostolicum et Patriarcham jure venerandum censeamus."

¹ The theory which I thus half accept is, I need not say, the favourite theory of Sir Francis Palgrave. To him, more than to any other scholar, we owe the assertion of the great truth, without which all mediæval history is an insoluble puzzle, that the Roman Empire did not come to an end in the year 476, but that the Empire and Imperial ideas continued to be the very life of European politics for ages after. On this head I must refer my readers to Mr. Bryce's brilliant Essay on the Holy Roman Empire, where the whole doctrine is drawn out with wonderful clearness and power. (See also North British Review, February 1865.) But Sir Francis Palgrave, as usual, made too much of his theory; his very learning and ingenuity carried him away, and the Imperial doctrine, as put forth by him, is greatly exaggerated. On the other hand, Mr. Kemble, as I before said, slurs the whole matter over in a strange way. I remember that, years ago, when I first began these studies, I was altogether carried away by the fascination of Sir Francis Palgrave's theories. I soon saw their exaggerated character, and how utterly unfounded a great part of them were. I was thus led to go too far the other way, and altogether to cast aside the notion of an Imperial sovereignty in our Kings. Later thought and study has at last brought me to an intermediate position, for which I trust stronger grounds will be found than for either of the extremes.

² For specimens of these styles see Macaulay, Hist. of Eng. i. 358.

CHAP. III. scribed by strange, foreign, and often quite unintelligible
 Prevalent designations, Roman, Greek, Persian, anything that came
 use of uppermost. Again, it is no less true that this sort of
 Greek and affectation is almost wholly confined to the Latin Charters.
 other Those which are drawn up in English are for the most
 strange titles. part simple and business-like, and in them the use of Im-
 This affec- perial titles is excessively rare.¹ The King is almost always
 tion hardly known in simply *Cyning*; his representative is content to be *Ealdor-*
 known in man or *Heretoga*. And the Imperial titles did not in Eng-
 the English land, as they did in Germany, enter into the popular speech.
 Charters. The German King became the *Kaiser*, almost to the exclu-
 sion of his kingly title; but the King of England to this
 day remains the King and has never grown into the *Casere*.
 Still I cannot look on such titles as *Basileus*, *Imperator*,
Imperator Augustus, as mere effusions of swelling rhetoric.
 We must remember that these were all formal titles, titles
 to which a very distinct meaning was attached, titles which
 expressed a special position and carried with them a special
 reverence, titles which were not taken up at random as
 they are now, by every upstart who, half in shame, half in
 self-conceit, shrinks from calling himself by the straight-
 forward title of King. Any one who knows what the
 mediæval theory of the Empire was will understand that
 for a man to call himself *Imperator Augustus* was in those
 days no light matter. It was the sort of thing which
 the vainest potentate would hardly do without some kind
 of reason for it. For an ordinary King to call himself
 Emperor² was very nearly as strong a measure as it

The Impe-
 rial titles
 then con-
 veyed a
 distinct
 meaning,
 and were
 not likely
 to be taken
 up at
 random.

¹ I have already quoted a charter of Eadred, the only one I know of in which the word *Casere* occurs. There is another of Æthelstan in 934 in which he is described (Col. Dipl. v. 218) as "Ongol-Saxna Cyning and *Brytanwalda callas Syses iglandas*." The Latin equivalent (p. 217) is "Angul-Saxonum necnon et totius Britanniae Rex, gratia Dei regni solio sublimatus."

² The best authenticated case is that of the two Alfonsos of Castile, who assumed the title of Emperor. (See Du Cange in *Imperator*.) But they did it on the same grounds on which I conceive the English King did, namely as claiming to be lords of all the princes of Spain. The West-Frankish and

would have been for an ordinary Archbishop to call him-
 self Pope. If the title of *Basileus* stood alone, it might
 possibly be merely an instance of the prevalent fondness
 for Greek titles; the King might be called *Basileus* only
 in the same vague way in which his Ealdormen are called
satrapæ and *archontes*.¹ Yet even this would be unlikely;
satrapæ and *archon* were not established titles, assumed
 by a single potentate in a special sense, and which the
 diplomacy of the age confined to that potentate. But
Basileus was such a title; it had become the Greek equi-
 valent of *Imperator*; it was the special title of the Eastern
 Emperors, the assumption of which by any other prince
 was held by them to be an infringement of their sole
 claim to represent the old Roman sovereignty. To be
 addressed as *Imperator* and *Basileus* by the ambassadors
 of Nikêphoros² is reckoned among the most brilliant
 triumphs of Charles the Great. It was the formal ac-
 knowledgement of the claims of the Western Cæsar at
 the hands of his Eastern colleague or rival. Later in
 the ninth century, the title of *Basileus* became the sub-
 ject of a curious diplomatic controversy between the rival
 claimants of the dignity which it denoted, Basil of the
 New, and Lewis of the Old, Rome.³ It is hard to believe
 that our Kings would have assumed a title surrounded by
 such associations, and which had been made the subject of

CHAP. III.

Force of
the word
Basileus.

French cases seem less decisive. Charles the Bald of course was really
 Emperor, having been crowned at Rome. Henry the Fowler and Otto were
 saluted "Imperatores" in the earlier Roman sense. Widukind, i. 39. iii. 49.

¹ The King himself sometimes sinks into an Archon. Col. Dipl. ii. 323, 4.

² Eginhard, An. 812. "Laudes ei dixerunt, Imperatorem eum et Basi-
 leum appellantes."

³ See the letter of Lewis (Imperator Augustus Romanorum) to Basil
 (sequè Imperator Novæ Romæ) in the Chronicle of Salerno, cap. 93 et
 seqq. (Muratori, t. ii. p. ii. p. 243.) He goes deep indeed into the
 matter. See also Liudprand, Legation (ib. t. ii. p. i. 479), and John Kinna-
 mos, lib. iv. pp. 247, 248 (ed. 1652). Frederick Barbarossa is only ῥῆξ
 Ἀλαμανῶν; the Eastern Emperor alone is βασιλεύς and αὐτοκράτωρ.

CHAP. III. such disputes, merely to make a sentence in a charter sound more swelling. It is hard to believe that they assumed it without a direct intention to claim thereby a distinctly Imperial sovereignty. Still, considering the fondness for Greek titles and Greek words of all kinds which the Charters so constantly display, if the title of *Basileus* stood alone, it might not be safe to lay too much stress upon it. But, when we also meet with *Cæsar*, *Imperator*, and *Augustus*, it is impossible to believe that any title of the class was assumed without a meaning. Whatever we say of the Greek title of *Basileus*, these Latin titles at least were not vague descriptions borrowed from a strange and half unintelligible language. They were titles in familiar use, titles which every one understood, titles which the diplomacy of the age studiously applied to one potentate and to one potentate only. They were titles whose force and use must have been perfectly well known to every man who understood the Latin language at all. It is utterly inconceivable that such titles should have been taken up at random. They could have had no object but to claim for the Prince who bore them a sovereignty of the same kind as that which belonged to the Prince for whom they were commonly reserved.

Still more distinct import of the other titles.

The titles meant to assert an Imperial position.

Granting then that the assumption of the Imperial titles had a meaning, and that it was not a mere piece of rhetorical vanity, the second question follows ;—Was there any real continuous Imperial tradition handed on from the days of the provincial Emperors, or were the Imperial titles simply assumed in imitation, or rivalry, or whatever it is to be called, of the contemporary German, Italian, and Byzantine Emperors? My own conviction is very decidedly in favour of the latter alternative.¹ I do not

¹ In all this I am arguing against Sir Francis Palgrave, *English Commonwealth*, i. 562 et seqq.

see how any continuous Imperial tradition could have been carried on from a Roman ruler in Britain to a West-Saxon King. Every circumstance of the English Conquest shuts out such a belief. It is likely enough that in Wales and Cornwall memories might still linger on from the days when Cæsars and Augusti reigned in Britain. It is likely enough that Aurelius or Arthur or any other Welsh leader may have put forward some sort of Imperial pretensions. But that these princes should have handed on such rights or claims to their English conquerors and destroyers seems to me utterly inconceivable. We have seen in the last Chapter how completely the English Conquest of Britain differed from all other Teutonic conquests. Elsewhere the conquerors became more or less Romanized; they rejoiced to receive from the reigning Emperor the investiture of some Roman dignity, some empty title of Consul or Patrician. From the assumption of the Imperial dignity itself our whole race shrank with a kind of superstitious awe till the spell was broken by the coronation of the Great Charles. This last motive indeed was one which could have no effect upon the mind of Ælle or Ceawlin; but its place would be fully supplied by utter ignorance, carelessness, and contempt for the titles and institutions of the vanquished. Consul, Patrician, Augustus, all would be alike unintelligible and despicable in their eyes. The chief assertor of this theory seems to hold that Ælle the South-Saxon, the first recorded Bretwalda, was called to the post of Emperor of Britain by an election of the Welsh Princes. Now it is not easy to see in what Ælle's Bretwaldadom consisted. It is possible that the Jutes of Kent, and the settlers who had already begun to Teutonize the East Coast of Britain, may have invested him with some sort of general leadership for the better carrying on of the Conquest. It is possible that he may have reduced to

CHAP. III.

No continuous tradition from the provincial Emperors.

The Bretwaldas not successors of the Provincial Emperors.

CHAP. III. tribute some Welsh tribes which he did not exterminate, and that he may so far have presented a dim foreshadowing of the glories of Æthelstan and Eadgar. But the days of the Commendation had not yet come. It is utterly incredible that Ælle held any authority over any Welsh tribe, save such as he won and held at the point of the sword. It is utterly incredible that any Welsh Congress ever assembled to make him Cæsar, Augustus, Tyrant, Bretwalda, or anything else. Cnut and William indeed were chosen Kings of the English by electors, many of whom must have shared as unwillingly in their work as any Welsh prince could have shared in the work of investing Ælle with an Imperial Crown. But the times were utterly different; Cnut and William were not mere destroyers; they took possession of an established Kingdom, and it was not their policy to destroy or to change one whit more than was absolutely necessary for their own purposes. But Ælle, who did to Anderida as Joshua had done to Jericho and to Ai, was little likely indeed to receive an Imperial diadem at the hands of the surviving Gibeonites. The dream of a transmission of Imperial authority from the vanquished Briton to his Teutonic conqueror certainly seems to me the vainest of all the dreams which ingenious men have indulged in.

Real position of the "Tyrants"

Again, we should remember what the true position of the so-called Tyrants¹ or Provincial Emperors really was.

¹ The word *Tyrant* in those times bore a sense which may be called a monarchical antitype of its old Greek sense. The Greek Tyrant was a man who obtained kingly power in a commonwealth; the Tyrants of the third and fourth centuries were men who revolted against a lawful Emperor. In both cases, the word in strictness expresses only the origin of power, and not the mode of its exercise. Many of the so-called Tyrants were excellent rulers. But the Imperial Tyrant had this great advantage over the Greek Tyrant, that success might turn him into a lawful Emperor, while the Greek Tyrant remained a Tyrant always. In mediæval writers the word is often used in this later Imperial sense, as equivalent to "usurper" or "pretender."

Carausius, Maximus, Constantine, and the rest, never called themselves Emperors of Britain. Of course, according to the strict Imperial theory, an Emperor of Britain is an absurd impossibility; the titles assumed by Eadgar are in themselves as ridiculous as the titles assumed by the persons who in later times have called themselves "Emperor of Austria," "Emperor of Hayti," "Emperor of Mexico," "Emperor of the French." The Emperor is essentially Lord of Rome and of the World; and it was only by setting itself up as being in some sort another world that Britain could lay any claim to either a Pope or an Emperor of its own. But the very last thought of the old Tyrants or Provincial Emperors would have been to claim any independent existence for Britain, Gaul, or any other part of the Empire of which they might have gained possession. Nothing could be further from their wishes than to set up anything like a separate national Kingdom. They were pretenders to the whole Empire, if they could get it, and they not uncommonly did get it in the end. A man who began as Tyrant often became a lawful Emperor, either by deposing the reigning Emperor or by being accepted by him as his colleague. Carausius, the first British Emperor according to this theory, held not only Britain but part of Gaul. It must not be thought that part of Gaul had been annexed to an Empire of Britain, like Calais by Edward the Third or Boulogne by Henry the Eighth.¹ It is simply that Britain and part of Gaul were those parts of the Empire of which Carausius, a candidate for the whole Empire, had been able actually to possess himself. At last Carausius was accepted as a colleague by Diocletian and Maximian, and so became a lawful Cæsar and Augustus. Allectus was less fortunate; he never got beyond Britain, and, instead

CHAP. III.

or provin-
cial Empe-
rors.Not Em-
perors of
Britain,
but pre-
tenders to
the whole
Roman
Empire
while pos-
sessing
only a part.Carausius.
286-294.Allectus.
294-297.

¹ Yet, as both Edward and Henry asserted a right to the Kingdom of France, their conquests may, in this point of view, be looked upon as really analogous to those of Carausius and the rest.

CHAP. III. of being acknowledged as a colleague, he was defeated and slain by Constantius. Constantius himself reigned in Britain; but no one would call Constantius a British Emperor, and Carausius was a British Emperor just as little. Magnentius, Maximus, Constantine, were simply Emperors whose career began in Britain, and not in Syria or Africa; they were not content to reign as British Emperors or Emperors of Britain; they speedily asserted their claim to as large a portion of the Roman world as they had strength to win and to keep. Now it is perfectly possible, especially if any of the Welsh Princes were descendants of Maximus, that a remembrance of these Emperors may have survived in Britain, and it is not unlikely that the conquest of Gaul by an Emperor who set forth from Britain may be the kernel of truth round which much of the mythical history of Arthur has gathered. But it is certainly hard to understand the analogy between a Roman General, trying to obtain the whole Roman Empire, but who is unable to obtain more than Britain, or than Britain and Gaul, and a Teutonic chief, winning by his own sword some sort of superiority over the other princes, Celtic and Teutonic, within the Isle of Britain. The essence of the position of Carausius and his successors is that they aspired to an universal dominion, and with such dominion any independent or national existence on the part of Britain would have been utterly inconsistent. The essence of the position of an English Bretwalda or Basileus is that he is the very embodiment of an independent national existence, that he aspires to a dominion purely insular, that he claims supremacy over everything within the Island, but aspires to no conquests beyond it. As I before said, the exact position of the Bretwalda or Brytenwealda, whether he be the "wide ruler" or the "ruler of Britain," is a most obscure subject, and it is extremely hard to make out the exact nature of the supremacy implied by the title. But

Magnen-
tius.
350.

Maximus.
383-388.

Constan-
tine.
407.

No an-
alogy be-
tween
these Em-
perors and
the Eng-
lish Bret-
waldas.

I think, on the one hand, that we may safely assert that the passages which describe that supremacy mean something and not nothing, that it did imply a real supremacy of some kind, and, on the other hand, that we may be equally sure that whatever it implied was something of purely English growth, something in no way connected with, or derived from, any older Welsh or Roman domination. Nothing is proved by the fact that Æthelberht imitated the coinage of Carausius and put a wolf and twins on his money. Nothing was more common than for the Teutonic states everywhere, and for the Saracen states too, to imitate the coinage which supplied them with their most obvious models. But on a coin of Carausius the wolf and twins had a most speaking meaning; on a coin of Æthelberht they had no meaning at all. It may be that Eadwine assumed some ensigns of dignity in imitation of Roman pomp;¹ with the Roman Paulinus at his elbow, he might well do so, without any necessity of traditions handed on from Maximus and Carausius. These are, I believe, the only attempts at evidence to prove that the Bretwaldadom had a Roman origin, and they prove about as much as King Ælfred's notion² that the immemorial Teutonic³ practice of the *wergild* was introduced by Christian Bishops in imitation of the mildheartedness of Christ. The title of Bretwalda may, at least in its later, though excessively rare, use, be fairly rendered by Emperor of Britain. But it is hard to see the likeness between a Wielder of Britain, Emperor so far as that he is independent of either Empire, and a

Nothing proved by Æthelberht's coinage or Eadwine's "tufa."

¹ Bæda, ii. 16. See Palgrave, i. 564.

² Laws of Ælfred. Thorpe, i. 58.

³ I should rather say Aryan than merely Teutonic;

καὶ μὲν τίς τε κασιγνήτοις φόνοιο
Ποιήν, ἢ οὐ παιδὸς ἐδέξατο τεθνεώτος·
Καὶ ῥ' ὁ μὲν ἐν δήμῳ μένει, αὐτοῦ, πόλλ' ἀποτίσας.

Π. ix. 628.

CHAP. III. Roman General, aspiring to reign on the Seven Hills, but who is unluckily shut up against his will within the four seas of Britain.¹

I infer then that the Imperial style affected by our Kings from Æthelstan onwards was not derived by any continuous tradition from any earlier British or Roman Empire. It is in their own circumstances, and in the general circumstances of Europe during the ninth and tenth centuries, that we must look for the causes which led them to challenge Imperial rank. Ecgberht, it should

Explanation to be found in the circumstances of the time.

Charles and Ecgberht.

800.

not be forgotten, was the friend, the guest, and no doubt the pupil, of Charles the Great.² Ecgberht was chosen to the West-Saxon throne in the very year in which the Old Rome re-asserted, in the person of Charles, her right to choose her own Emperor. We cannot doubt that, through his whole career, he had Charles before him as his model, and that his object was to establish for himself the same kind of dominion in his own island which Charles had established on the Continent. But Ecgberht never assumed any higher style than that of King of the English, and even that, as far as we know, but once only.³ In his days, under his benefactor and his benefactor's son, the unity of the Western Empire was still unbroken. It was enough for the West-Saxon King to feel himself wellnigh the only independent Prince in Western Christendom, without setting himself up as a rival Emperor. The schemes of Ecgberht, checked under his immediate successors by the Danish invasions, were in the end really promoted by those invasions,

The plans of Ecgberht, checked, yet in the end helped,

¹ I assume the case of such an Emperor or Tyrant reigning in Britain and Britain only. But this could have happened only in the case of those fleeting Tyrants of whom the land was said to be fertile, and who rose and fell without being recorded. All the more famous men of the class, Carausius, Maximus, Constantine, possessed some part of the continental dominions of the Empire, and sought to possess the whole.

² See above, p. 40.

³ *Ib.*

through the weakening and destruction of the other English Kingdoms. At last his whole plan was carried out in the latest days of Eadward, and it was established in a more thoroughly organized form by Æthelstan. The whole Isle of Britain was now, in different degrees of subjection and dependency, under their supreme dominion. Now, and not before, begins the use of the Imperial titles.

CHAP. III.
by the
Danish
invasions,
were fully
carried
out by
Eadward
and Æthel-
stan.

Æthelstan, in whose reign the connexion between England and the Continent was so unusually busy, Æthelstan, Lord of all Britain, and connected by marriage and friendship with all the greatest princes of Europe, could hardly fail to realize the greatness of his own position. He might well feel himself to be the peer of Emperors. He was the one Prince whose dominions had never, since his own nation entered them, acknowledged any superiority in the Lord of either Rome. Of our island at least might be said, whether in honour or in reproach,

Greatness
of the po-
sition of
Æthelstan.

His as-
sumption
of the
Imperial
style.

"De tributo Cæsaris nemo cogitabat ;
Omnes erant Cæsares ; nemo censum dabat."¹

Whatever vague and transitory homage Cæsar may have received from Scots or Northumbrians, it is certain that no King of the West-Saxons ever knew a superior beyond the limits of his own island. But, from the days of Ecgberht onwards, every King of the West-Saxons had claimed or aspired to a superiority of his own through the whole extent of his own island ; and now Æthelstan had converted those lofty dreams into a living reality. Gaul, Spain, Italy, Denmark, the Slavonic and other less known tribes beyond the Elbe, all had bowed to the dominion of the first Teutonic Cæsar. To England alone he had been a model and a counsellor, but not a master. As the one perfectly independent prince in Western Christendom, Æthelstan was the equal of Emperors, and within his own island he held the same

Points of
analogy
between
his posi-
tion and
that of the
Emperors.

Position which the Emperors

¹ Grimm's Gedichte auf König Friedrich (Berlin 1844), p. 65.

CHAP. III. held in the rest of the world. Like an Emperor, he not only had his own Kingdom, governed under him by his own Dukes or Ealdormen, but his Kingdom was surrounded by a circle of vassal princes who paid to him the homage which he himself paid to no superior upon earth. As no other prince in Western Christendom could claim for his own Kingdom the same perfect independence of all Imperial superiority, so no other prince in Western Christendom could show, among a crowd of dependent princes, so perfect a reproduction of the Imperial majesty. And it must not be forgotten that, during the first half of the tenth century, there was not, as there was before and after, any one Emperor universally acknowledged by all the Christian states of the West. The days of the Carolingian Cæsars were past; the days of the Saxon Cæsars were not yet come. Guy, Lambert, Berengar, were Augusti not less fleeting, and far more feeble, than any of the Tyrants of whom Britain had once been so fertile. The King of the English and Lord of all Britain might well feel himself a truer representative of Imperial greatness than Emperors whose rule was at most confined to a corner of Italy. He was, beyond all doubt, the second, if not the first, among Western Kings. The Kings of the Eastern Franks, not yet Emperors in formal rank, but marked out in the eyes of all men as the predestined heirs of Charles, were the only rulers who could be held to surpass him in power and glory. Without waiting for any formal coronation, the soldiers of Henry and Otto had saluted their victorious Kings as *Imperatores* and *Patres Patriæ*, and, with the same feeling, Æthelstan assumed, or received from his counsellors, the titles which placed him on a level with them. The new birth of the Empire, during the reign of Eadgar, the coronation of Otto the Great, which at once restored to the Imperial Crown no small portion of its ancient power and

No universally
acknowledged
Emperor
at this
time.
888-896.

Revival
of the
Empire
under Otto,
[962.]

dignity, would by no means tend to make our princes lay aside any Imperial claims which they had already asserted. Eadgar was on the best terms with his Imperial uncle; still it might be thought needful to assert that England owed him no sort of homage, and that the other Princes of Britain owed homage to Eadgar and not to Otto.

CHAP. III.
not likely
to make
the Eng-
lish Kings
withdraw
their Im-
perial
claims.

Here then, as it seems to me, and not in any traditions of Ambrosius or Carausius, is to be found the true explanation of the otherwise startling title of Emperor of Britain. It was meant at once to assert the independence of the English Crown upon any foreign superior, and to assert the dependence of all the other powers of Britain upon the English Crown. It was meant to assert that the King of the English was not the homager but the peer, alike of the Emperor of the West and of the Basileus of the East, and to assert that Scots, Welsh, and Cumbrians owed no duty to Rome or to Byzantium, but only to their Father and Lord at Winchester. The Imperial titles last in common use down to the Norman Conquest; after that, their employment is rare, and they gradually die out altogether. And why? Because the Norman and Angevin Kings, though by no means disposed willingly to abate a tittle of the rights of their predecessors within the four seas of Britain, were far from looking on insular dominion as the main object of their policy. They were Kings of England, and they knew the strength and value of England; still they valued England mainly as a nursery of men and a storehouse of money to serve their projects of continental ambition. Primarily they were Counts of Anjou, Dukes of Normandy and Aquitaine, striving after an equality with, perhaps a superiority over, their own liege lord at Paris. The British Empire in which Æthelstan gloried, and in which Cnut, in the midst of his Northern triumphs,

Full im-
port of the
Imperial
titles.

They go
out of use
after the
Norman
Conquest,
because
insular
dominion
is no longer
the chief
object.

- CHAP. III. gloried hardly less, was something which seemed hardly worth keeping in the eyes of Richard, and was something which could hardly be kept in the feeble grasp of John and Henry the Third. At last, in the Great Edward, there again arose a true Bretwalda, one who saw that the dominion of Æthelstan and Eadgar was a worthier prize than shadowy dreams of aggrandizement beyond the sea. But by this time the notion of a British Empire had given way to more purely feudal ideas, and his claims to supremacy took their shape accordingly. But traces of the old ideas still lingered on. If no Imperial claims were put forward on behalf of England, it was thought needful carefully to exclude all claims on the part of any other power to Imperial supremacy over England. A formal declaration to that effect was made in the time of Edward the Second;¹ a renunciation of all supremacy was required from Sigismund, King of the Romans, before he was allowed to land in England;² and, in the sixteenth century, along with the revived study of our early history, the Imperial titles themselves seem to revive in a more definite form. The Parliament of Henry the Eighth, in renouncing all jurisdiction on the part of the Roman Pontiff, clothed the renunciation in words whose force can hardly be misunderstood, and which seem designed expressly to exclude the supremacy of the Roman Cæsar as well.³ In an Irish Act of the same reign
- The old claims take a more strictly feudal shape under Edward the First.
- Later traces of the ideas.
- 1320.
- 1416.
- 1533.
- 1537.

¹ "Quod Regnum Angliæ ab omni subjectione Imperiali sit liberrimum." Selden, *Titles of Honour*, p. 21 (b. i. c. 2).

² Selden, u. s. Lingard, iii. 505. Bryce, 207. But the account in Redman, p. 49, and Elmham, *Liber Metr.* p. 133, is much less explicit.

³ In the Statute of Appeals, "Whereas by divers and sundry old authentic histories and chronicles, it is manifestly declared and expressed that this realm of England is an *Empire*, and so hath been accepted in the world; governed by one supreme head and King, having the dignity and royal estate of the *Imperial Crown* of the same . . . without restraint, or provocation to any foreign prince or potentate of the world." So again, "to keep it from the annoyance as well of the See of Rome as from the

a further step is taken, and the King is distinctly spoken of as Emperor.¹ In the days of Charles the Fifth such an assertion of independence may not have been altogether needless. Henry may have deemed it prudent to take the same precaution against his Imperial nephew which Eadgar had taken against his Imperial uncle. Declarations of the like sort were again made in the reign of Elizabeth. In the debate on restoring to the Crown the ecclesiastical jurisdiction surrendered under Mary, those who opposed Elizabeth's spiritual claims still pointedly described her as being, in temporal matters, "our King and Queen, our Emperor and Empress." At her Coronation her herald formally proclaimed her as "most worthy Empress from the Orcade Isles to the Mountains Pyreneae."² In this last description we find the key to the style. An Empire implied subordinate Kingdoms. Elizabeth claimed to be Empress as being independent of the continental Emperor; she also claimed to be Empress as having a royal vassal within her own island. The same phrases which assert the independence of England upon the German Emperor also assert the dependence of Scotland upon the English Empress.³

CHAP. III.

1559.

authority of other foreign potentates attempting the diminution or violation thereof." Selden, p. 18. Froude, Hist. Eng. i. 410-412.

¹ "The Crown of England in other Parliaments of later times is titled the Imperial Crown; the Kings of England being also in the express words of an Irish Parliament titled *Kings and Emperours of the Realm of England and of the Land of Ireland*, and that before the title of Lord of Ireland was allied with King." Selden, u. s. Yet the assumption of the regal title for Ireland would, according to ancient ideas, make the King's position rather less Imperial than before.

² See Strickland's Life of Elizabeth, p. 166, where a very strange interpretation is put on the words. "The Mountains Pyreneae" are Elizabeth's own flourish, but the "Orcade Isles" might seem to come out of a charter of Æthelred (Cod. Dipl. iii. 346); "*Angligenum, Orcadarum necne in gyro jacentium Monarchus.*"

³ I would not be understood as asserting the justice or honesty of any such claim. The Commendation of 929 was annulled by the renunciation

929
M

CHAP. III.

Growth of
the Eng-
lish system
of depen-
dencies.
827-1866.

Imperial
character
still re-
tained by
England.

This then I believe to be the true account of the Imperial titles and Imperial pretensions of the English Kings in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Our Kings meant to assert at once their own perfect independence and the dependence of the other princes of Britain upon them. It is perhaps worth notice that in all this we may see the beginnings of a system which has gone on to our own day. From the days of Egberht onwards, the House of Cerdic has never been without its dependencies. Their sphere has gradually been enlarged; as nearer dependencies have been incorporated with the central state, another more distant circle of dependencies has arisen beyond them. Wessex held the supremacy over England; England held it over Britain; Britain held it over Ireland and a crowd of smaller islands and colonies; the United Kingdom holds it over colonies and dependencies of every kind, from Man to New Zealand. Since the days of the Roman Republic, no other country has had so large an experience of the relations between a central power and half-incorporated states of various kinds. In this sense, England is now a more truly Imperial power than any other in the world. Putting aside the local associations of Rome and Constantinople, no modern state comes so near to the notion of an Empire as understood either by Æthelstan or by Otto. There is therefore an historical meaning in the familiar phrases of "the British Empire" and "the Imperial Parliament," whether any remembrance of ancient Bretwaldas and Basileis was or was not present to the minds of those who devised them.

Summary.

I thus bring to an end my survey of the political condition of England and its dependent states in the tenth

of 1328. From that time Scotland must be looked on as an independent Kingdom, and, as such, she rightly entered into the Union with England on equal terms.

and eleventh centuries. The dominion won by Eadward and Æthelstan was handed over nearly unimpaired to William the Bastard. We have seen what that dominion was. There was a home monarchy in which the power of the King was strictly limited by law, but in which his personal influence was almost unbounded. There was also an external suzerainty over a body of vassal princes who had the right and the duty, though perhaps but seldom the will, to appear in the Great Council of their over-lord along with the Bishops and Ealdormen of his own realm. This dominion was, by the forced election of the English Witan, transferred to the hands of the Norman Conqueror. Under his successors the character of the monarchy gradually altered, but far more through a change in the spirit of the administration than through any actual changes in the laws. The power of the Crown gradually increased, and the Kingdom gradually changed from the old Teutonic to the later mediæval form. But it was always the constitutional doctrine that William, a legal claimant of the Crown, received the Crown as it had been held by his predecessors. It follows that a thorough knowledge of the position of those predecessors, of the nature of their authority and of the limits on their power, is absolutely necessary, if only to understand the position of the Norman Kings, what changes they made and what changes they did not make. I have therefore not scrupled, as an introduction to the narrative portion of my history, to set forth the main principles of our ancient constitution at some length. But I have confined myself to the political constitution, as that branch of the subject without a knowledge of which the later history would be unintelligible. Many legal and social points, and the whole general antiquities of the period, I leave to those writers whose subjects naturally lead them to a more distinct consideration of those branches of inquiry. Many points of detail will come

CHAP. III.
The old Kingdom and Empire transferred to William. Gradual changes after the Conquest.

CHAP. III. in for a more appropriate mention at those stages of the narrative which naturally suggest them. One most important branch of my subject, an examination of the different ranks of society in England at the time of the Norman Conquest, I purposely reserve. That examination can find no place so appropriate as the point where our story brings us to the great source of information on the subject, a source of information less valuable only than our national Chronicles themselves, the imperishable monument of the administrative wisdom of the Conqueror, the precious record of Domesday Book.

In my next Chapter I shall conclude the preliminary part of the subject by a sketch of the history of the Norman Duchy from its foundation to the time when Norman and English affairs come into contact.

CHAPTER IV.

SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF NORMANDY DURING THE TENTH CENTURY.¹

THE two foreign conquests of England which form the main subject of English history during the eleventh century were effected by nations which were

¹ For the Norman and French history of the tenth century there are three principal authorities. The only writer on the Norman side is Dudo, Dean of Saint Quintin, whose work will be found in Duchesne's *Rerum Normannicarum Scriptores*. His history is nearly coincident with the century, going down to the death of Richard the Fearless. He is a most turgid and wearisome writer, without chronology or arrangement of any kind. He is in fact one of the earliest of a very bad class of writers, those who were employed, on account of their supposed eloquence, to write histories which were of course intended only as panegyrics of their patrons. It is only just before the end of his narrative that Dudo begins to be a contemporary witness; for all the rest he simply repeats such traditions as were acceptable at the Norman court. Of the two French writers, Flodoard or Frodoard, Canon of Rheims (whose Annals will be found in the third volume of Pertz), is a far more valuable writer in himself, but his notices of Norman affairs are few and meagre. He perhaps avoids speaking of the terrible strangers any more than he can help. Flodoard is a mere annalist, and aspires to no higher rank, but in his own class he ranks very high. He is somewhat dull and dry, as becomes an annalist, but he is thoroughly honest, sensible, and straightforward. His Annals reach from 919 to 966, the year of his death, so that he is strictly contemporary throughout. The other French writer is Richer, Monk of Rheims, whose work was discovered by Pertz, and is printed in his third volume (also separately in his smaller collection, and in a French edition by M. Guadet, with a French translation, 2 vols. Paris, 1845). He was the son of Rudolf, a knight and counsellor of King Lewis the Fourth, and derived much of his information from his father. He also makes use of the work of Flodoard. He goes down to 998, which was seemingly the year of his death. Richer is not

CHAP. IV.
Normans
and Eng-
lish origi-
nally kins-
men.

Practical,
but unre-
cognized,
effects
of this
kindred.

The Danes
in England
become
English-
men.

originally of the same stock. First came the Danes themselves; then came the Normans, the descendants of Danish or other Scandinavian settlers in Gaul. In mere blood therefore the Normans were in some measure allied to all the Teutonic inhabitants of Britain, and they were closely allied to the descendants of the Danish settlers in the North and East of England. And there can be little doubt that this original community of blood really had an important practical effect, and that the final fusion of Normans and English was greatly promoted by the fact that conquerors and conquered were in truth kinsmen.

But this influence was a purely silent one, and was wholly unrecognized by those on whom it acted. Neither side thought at all of any kindred as existing between them.

And, to all appearance, no two nations of Western Europe could have been found which, in speech, feelings, and manners, differed more widely from one another.

The Danes who settled in England had been easily turned into Englishmen. Though the likeness of speech and institutions between the two nations has often been exaggerated, it was something not only real but palpable. It needed no historical research to find it out; it was something which men of both nations could feel for themselves. Amongst the various Teutonic settlers in Britain, we can well believe that there were some whose original kindred with the Teutons of Scandinavia was quite as close as their original kindred with some of their fellow Teutons in Britain. Anyhow, the lan-

content with being an annalist; he aspires to be an historian. He is much fuller and more vivid than Flodoard, but I cannot look on him as equally trustworthy. On this writer see Palgrave, *History of Normandy and England*, i. 748. The second volume of Sir Francis' own work contains a most vivid, though very discursive and garrulous, history of the time before us, full of all the merits and defects of its author. I would refer to an article of mine on it in the *Edinburgh Review* for April 1859; also to another, "The Franks and Gauls," in the *National Review* for October 1860. Portions of both these articles have been worked up in the present Chapter.

guages of the two nations were closely allied; their institutions were very similar, those of England being doubtless the more advanced and regularly organized of the two. Religion formed the main difference between them; but the Danes in England soon adopted the Christian faith, and they were followed, after no very great interval, by their brethren in Denmark. Thus the Danish settler in England, when once baptized, easily became an Englishman, differing from the Angle or the Saxon only as the Angle and the Saxon differed from one another. This absorption into a kindred nation is less remarkable than the fact that the same people should, with not much greater difficulty, have adopted a language and culture which was wholly alien to them. For, as the Danes who settled in England became Englishmen, so the Danes who settled in Gaul equally became Frenchmen. The Normans of the eleventh century were men of Scandinavian descent who had cast away every outward trace of the language, manners, and feelings which made them kindred to Englishmen, and had adopted instead the language, manners, and feelings of Latin France. Before they landed in England, they had become Frenchmen; though still proud of the Norman name, they were content, as speakers of the French language, to call themselves Frenchmen in distinction from the Teutonic English.¹ No doubt the old Scandinavian element was still at work within them; it made them Frenchmen on a far nobler and grander

CHAP. IV.

The Danes
in Gaul
become
French-
men.

¹ I have elsewhere shown the inaccuracy and misleading character of the vulgar way of dividing the inhabitants of England after the Conquest into "Normans and Saxons." Of course "Normans and Saxons" were never opposed, because the English were never called Saxons. "Normans and English" are often opposed, especially by Norman writers. But in official documents, and also in the *English Chronicles*, the opposition is always between "French and English." Of course very many among William's followers were not Normans, and even the true Normans were felt, and felt themselves, to be French as distinguished from English.

CHAP. IV. scale than other Frenchmen, and it enabled them, when they had once settled in England, unconsciously, but surely, to become Englishmen. Still, when they followed their Duke to the Conquest of England, they were in every outward respect Frenchmen and no longer Scandinavians. In a word, they were no longer *Northmen* but *Normans*; the change in the form of the name aptly expresses the change in those who bore it.¹

§ 1. *General Effects of the Scandinavian Settlement in Gaul.*

Import-
ance of
the Nor-
man set-
tlement
in Gaul.

Compari-
son of the
settlements
of Rolf and
Guthrum.

The settlement of the Northmen in Gaul, and their subsequent change into Normans, is the great event of the first half of the tenth century; it challenges a place alongside of the restoration of the Empire by Otto in the second half. Its beginnings indeed might seem small. A band of Scandinavian pirates settled in Northern Gaul, exactly as another band of Scandinavian pirates had, thirty years before, settled in Eastern Britain. In both cases the sovereign of the invaded land found it expedient to secure the safety of the rest of his dominions, by surrendering a portion of them to the invader, and by requiring baptism and nominal homage as guarantees for peace and good neighbourhood. The settlement of Rolf in Neustria is exactly analogous to the settlement of Guthrum in East-Anglia. Charles the Simple and his counsellors may well have justified their act to themselves by quoting the example of the Great Ælfred. But the results of the two events were widely different. The East-Anglian and Northumbrian Danes were fused into the ge-

¹ Dudo always has "Northmanni;" the country is only beginning to have a name; it is sometimes "Northmannia," sometimes only "Terra Northmannorum," "Northmannica regio," and the like. In the next century the people have become "Normanni," and their land has become "Normannia," "Normandie." "Northmannia," with Eginhard, meant Denmark.

neral mass of Englishmen, and they were soon distinguished from other Englishmen by nothing more than mere provincial differences. But the settlement of Rolf in Neustria had far wider results. It affected the later history of all Europe. The Scandinavians in Gaul embraced the creed, the language, and the manners of their French neighbours, without losing a whit of their old Scandinavian vigour and love of adventure. The people thus formed became the foremost apostles alike of French chivalry and of Latin Christianity. They were the Saracens of Christendom, spreading themselves over every corner of the world and appearing in almost every character. They were the foremost in devotion, the most fervent votaries of their adopted creed, the most lavish in gifts to holy places at home, the most unwearied in pilgrimages to holy places abroad. And yet none knew better how to hold their own against Pope and Prelate; the special children of the Church were as little disposed to unconditional obedience as the most stiff-necked of Ghibelines. And they were no less the foremost in war; they were mercenaries, crusaders, plunderers, conquerors; but they had changed their element, they had changed their mode of warfare; no Norman fleets went forth on the errand of the old Wikings; the mounted knight and the unerring bowman had taken the place of the elder tactics which made the fortress of shields invincible. North, south, east, the Norman lances were lifted; and they were lifted in the most opposite of causes. Norman warriors pressed into the remotest East to guard Eastern Christendom against the first Turkish invader, and other Norman warriors were soon found to be the most dangerous enemies of Eastern Christendom in its own home. If the Norman fought by the side of Rômanos at Manzikert, he threatened the Empire of Alexios with destruction at Dyrrhachion. His conquests brought with them the most opposite results in

CHAP. IV.

Results of the Norman settlement on general history.

Their prominence in devotion,

and in war.

Change of their tactics.

Their exploits in the Eastern Empire,

1071.

1081.

CHAP. IV. different lands. To free England he gave a line of tyrants ;
in England, to enslaved Sicily he gave a line of beneficent rulers. But
in Sicily.

Influence
of the
Normans
on art ;
their wel-
come of
foreigners.

Disappear-
ance of the
Norman
race,

in Sicily,

in Britain.

to England he gave also a conquering nobility, which in a few generations became as truly English in England as it had become French in Normandy. If he overthrew our Harolds and our Waltheofs, he gave us a Fitzwalter and a Bigod to win back the rights for which Harold and Waltheof had fallen. In the arts of peace, like his Mahometan prototypes, he invented nothing ; but he learned, adapted, improved, and disseminated everything. He ransacked Europe for scholars, poets, theologians, and artists. At Rouen, at Palermo, and at Winchester, he welcomed merit in men of every race and every language. He guided Lanfranc and Anselm from Lombardy to Bec and from Bec to Canterbury. Art, under his auspices, produced alike the stern grandeur of Caen and Ely, and the brilliant gorgeousness of Palermo and Monreale. In a word, the indomitable vigour of the Scandinavian, joined to the buoyant vivacity of the Gaul, produced the conquering and ruling race of Europe. And yet that race, as a race, has vanished. It has everywhere been absorbed by the races which it has conquered. From both Sicilies it has vanished as though it had never been. And there, along with the Norman, have vanished the races which he used as his instruments, and which he alone taught to work in harmony. Greek, Saracen, and Norman have alike disappeared from the realm of Good King William. In our own land the fate of the Norman has been different. He remains in his lineage and in his works, but he is Norman no longer. He has settled in every corner of the British islands ; into every corner of those islands he has carried with him the inborn qualities of his own race, but in every corner of those islands he has assumed the outward characteristics of the races among which he settled. The Scottish Bruce or the Irish

Geraldine passed from Scandinavia to Gaul, from Gaul CHAP. IV. to England, from England to his own portion of our islands; but at each migration he ceased to be Scandinavian, French, or English; his patriotism was in each case transferred to his new country, and his historic being belongs wholly to his last acquired home. In England itself the Norman has vanished from sight no less than from Apulia and insular Sicily. He has sunk beneath the silent and passive influence of a race less brilliant but more enduring than his own. The Norman has Famous men of Norman descent. vanished from the world, but he has indeed left a name behind him. Of him came Richard the Fearless and William the Bastard; of him came that Robert whose foot was 1099. first placed upon the ransomed battlements of the Holy City, and that mightier Robert who in one year beheld 1086. the Cæsars of East and West flee before him.¹ And of Frederick the Second. his stock, far more truly than of that of Imperial Swabia, came the Wonder of his own and of all succeeding ages,² —poet, scholar, warrior, legislator; the terror and the marvel of Christendom and of Islam; the foe alike of Roman Pontiffs and of Moslem Sultans; who won alike the golden crown of Rome and the thorny crown of Salem; dreaded in one world as the foremost champion of Christ, cursed in another as the apostate votary of Mahomet—the gay, the brave, the wise, the relentless, and the godless Frederick.

But on no country was the effect of the Scandinavian Effects of the Norman settlement in Gaul more important than it was upon Gaul

¹ “Sic uno tempore victi
Sunt terræ Domini duo; Rex Alemannicus iste,
Imperii Rector Romani maximus ille:
Alter ad arma ruens armis superatur, et alter
Nominis auditi solâ formidine cecidit.”

Guil. App. apud Murat. vol. v. p. 274.

² Matt. Paris, p. 804, Wats. “Principum mundi maximus Fredericus, stupor quoque mundi et immutator mirabilis.” P. 806, “Stupor mundi Fredericus.”

CHAP. IV.
settlement
on French
history.

Period of
struggle
in West-
France.
888-987.

itself. It may sound like a strange paradox, but there can be little doubt that it was the settlement of the Northern pirates which finally made Gaul French in the modern sense. Their settlement was made during the transitional period of West-Frankish history. The modern French nation and language were just beginning to appear. Paris, not yet the capital, had been found to be the most important military post in the Kingdom, and the Lords of Paris had shown themselves to be its most vigorous defenders. The tenth century was a period of struggle between the Teutonic and the Romance tongues, between Laôn and Paris, between the descendants of Charles the Great and the descendants of Robert the Strong.¹ The Norman stepped into the scene of confusion, and finally decided the quarrel in favour of the French² dynasty of Paris against the Frankish dynasty

¹ This time of struggle is the subject of the second volume of Sir Francis Palgrave's *History of Normandy and England*. The character of the period cannot be better summed up than it is by Widukind, lib. i. c. 29. "Unde usque hodie certamen est de regno Karolorum stirpi et posteris Odonis, concertatio quoque Regibus Karolorum et orientalium Francorum super regno Lotharii."

"Regnum Lotharii" is of course Lotharingia, Lothringen, Lorraine, though it must be remembered that the name takes in a far wider territory than the modern Duchy. But it should also be noticed that West-France has, in this passage, no name; its Kings are "Reges Karolorum;" it was quite a chance that France was not permanently called *Carolingia* to match *Lotharingia*. So in Widukind (ii. 2) West-France is "regnum Karoli," though in the reign of a Lewis; so, still more distinctly, in the *Gesta Episcoporum Cameracensium* (i. 55. Pertz, vii. 421) the inhabitants of West-France and Lotharingia are distinguished as "*Karlenses*" and "*Lotharienses*." This way of describing countries by their rulers is very common just at this time, when divisions were springing up for which there were no received geographical names. Thus Germany is sometimes "*Terra Heinrici*;" Flanders and Normandy are, in our own Chronicles, "*Baldwines land*" and "*Ricardes rice*." But Lotharingia, perhaps as denoting the most purely artificial division of all, is the only name of the class which has survived.

² One cannot avoid making some such distinction as this, when dealing with the ambiguous word "Francus." In strictness *Franci* are the Franks, on whichever side of the Rhine; *Francia* is their country, wherever it may

of Laón. It will not be foreign to our subject to trace out the history of this process a little more fully. Modern France has nothing to do with either of the two dynasties whose associations she so persistently usurps, the Karlings and their predecessors the Merwings. Those dynasties were essentially German; if any Romance element had begun to show itself under the later Merwings, the establishment of the Austrasian Karlings threw it altogether back. Till the ninth century there was no geographical division which at all answered to Modern France.¹ The Frankish territory, properly so called, answered to Northern France and Central Germany. This was the Francia of the Merwings. Aquitaine, or Gaul south of the Loire, was held in more or less of

CHAP. IV.

Origin of
Modern
France.Modern
France in
no way
answers to
the ancient
"Francia."

be, *Franconia* no less than *France*. But it would seem that, within Western *Francia*, the word *Franci* began early to mean Western as opposed to Eastern Franks. Thus the Astronomer (ap. Pertz, ii. 17) speaks of Lewis the Pious as "monitus tam à Francis quamque à Germanis," and again (p. 633), "diffidens Francis, magisque se credens Germanis." So Liudprand (Antapod. i. 14-17) uses "*Rex Galliarum*" and "*Rex Francorum*" as synonymous. On the other hand, in Germany, *Franci* kept its natural meaning down to the days of Frederick Barbarossa. "Sic emitur à Francis Imperium," says Otto of Freisingen (Gest. Frid. ii. 22). So William of Malmesbury (i. 68), in a passage the whole of which is worth study, says; "Lotharingi et Alamanni, et cæteri Transrhenani populi qui Imperatori Teutonicorum subjecti sunt, magis propriè se Francos appellari jubent; et eos quos nos Francos putamus, *Galwalas* antiquo vocabulo [did William know the force of the *walas*?] quasi Gallos nuncupant. Quibus et ego assensum commodo," &c.

¹ I understand by "Modern France" the extent of territory, which, before the annexations at the expense of the Empire began, was held either by the King of the French in domain, or by Princes who held of him in fief. From the France of the modern map we must take away the French part of Hennegau, Lothringen and the three Bishopricks, Elsass, the County of Burgundy, Savoy, Lyons, Bresse, Dauphiny, Provence, Nizza, and Corsica. We must add the still independent part of Flanders, the County of Barcelona, and the Channel Islands.

Richer (iv. 12, 13) gives two descriptions of the extent of the French Kingdom in the tenth century. Hugh Capet is made King over "Galli, Britanni, Dahi [doubtless *Dani*, i. e. the Normans], Aquitani, Gothi, Hispani [the County of Barcelona], Wascones." He then associates his son Robert in the Kingdom—"à Mosa fluvio usque ad Oceanum *Occidentalibus* Regem præfecit et ordinavit."

CHAP. IV. external subjection, but it was never thoroughly incorporated, far less occupied. Paris, in Merovingian times, was one royal city out of four or five. Under the Karlings Italy and Saxony were first acquired, Aquitaine and Bavaria were for the first time really incorporated. The capital of the Frankish realm, as distinguished from the Roman Empire, was Aachen. The languages of the Empire were Latin and Teutonic; the Romance dialects were still only provincial varieties of Latin. Charles the Great more than once contemplated a division of his Empire, but not one of his proposed divisions at all answered to modern France. Modern France makes its first indistinct appearance in the division on the death of Lewis the Pious. Then, for the first time, Northern and Southern Gaul, Neustria and Aquitaine, were united as the Kingdom of Charles the Bald. Their union was purely accidental. Charles was already King of Neustria, when his father, wishing to enlarge the dominions of his favourite son, added the Kingdom of Aquitaine, which had fallen vacant by the death of his brother Pippin.¹ The hold of Charles and his successors on Aquitaine was exceedingly weak, but the nominal right continued, and, ages afterwards, it became a reality. The Kingdom thus formed by the union of Neustria and Aquitaine was the first germ of modern France. It roughly answers to its geographical extent, and, what is still more to the purpose, we see that a new nation was springing up within it. The language of the people was beginning to be recognized. At the famous treaty of Strassburg, the Austrasian soldiers of

First
glimpse of
Modern
France.

839.

841.

¹ One writer, Erchempert (*Hist. Langobardorum*, 11. Pertz, iii. 245), sees only Aquitaine, and leaves out Neustria. "Ab hoc Francorum divisum est regnum, quoniam Lutharius Aquensem et Italicum, Ludogicus autem Baioarium, Karlus vero, ex aliâ ortus genitrice, Aquitanicum regebat imperium."

Observe that Lotharingia here becomes the "Empire of Aachen," and that Saxony and the rest of Germany are merged in Bavaria, as Neustria is in Aquitaine. The form *Ludogicus*, with the *gu* for the *w*, is worth noting philologically.

Lewis swear in Old-High-Dutch, the Neustrian soldiers of Charles swear in Romance.¹ The language of the oath is something which we can no longer call Latin, and which we certainly cannot yet call French. Thus this precious document shows us the existence of a Gaul which has ceased to be either Celtic, Latin, or Teutonic; it shows in short that one most important step had been taken towards the creation of modern France. The final settlement of Verdun confirmed the existence of the new Kingdom. The Empire was divided into three Kingdoms, the Western, the Eastern, and the narrow debateable ground between them, known as Lotharingia. This last Kingdom fell to pieces, while the Kingdoms on each side of it grew, flourished, and contended for its fragments. These are the two Kingdoms of the East and the West Franks,² which it is already hardly possible to avoid calling by the familiar names of Germany and France.

CHAP. IV.

First glimpses of the Romance of Gaul.

843.

Neustria and Aquitaine were never again formally separated till the Peace of Bretigny in the fourteenth century.³ Neustria and Austrasia were never again united except during the ephemeral reign of Charles the Fat. That

1360.

Union under Charles the Fat. 885-888.

¹ "Lingua Romana," according to Nithard (iii. 5. Pertz, ii. 666). In the next century the language became nationalized, and in Richer (iv. 100, cf. i. 20, iii. 85) it appears as "lingua Gallica," which becomes its usual later name.

I leave to professed philologists to fix the exact relation of the "lingua Romana" of Nithard to French and to Provençal respectively. For my purpose it is enough that it is Romance as distinguished both from Latin and from Teutonic.

² "Francia Teutonica, Francia Orientalis," "Francia Latina, Francia Occidentalis." (See especially Bruno, Bell. Sax. 36, ap. Pertz, vii. 342.) So Liudprand (i. 14, 16), "Franciam quam Romanam dicunt." Sometimes "Occidentales" (see the extract from Richer, p. 173) is equivalent to French, and "Orientales" (Dudo, 130 B) to German, even without the addition of *Franci*.

³ That is, Aquitaine was, up to the Peace of Bretigny, always held in nominal vassalage to France, but, except during the momentary occupation when Philip the Fair had outwitted Edmund of Lancaster, no Parisian King was immediate sovereign of Bourdeaux till Aquitaine finally lost its independence in the fifteenth century.

CHAP. IV. Emperor, the last who reigned over both the Eastern and the Western Franks,¹ was deposed by common consent of his various Kingdoms. Four Kingdoms now appeared,² which we can now call by no names but those of Germany, Italy, France, and Burgundy. And now a more important step still was taken in the direction of modern France. The West Franks—we may now almost call them French—took to themselves a new dynasty and a new capital. The division of 843 first introduced us to a Romance—that is, substantially a Celtic—France, as distinguished from the elder Teutonic Francia of the old Frankish Kings. The division of 888 first introduces us to a Capetian and a Parisian France. Since the death of the Great Charles, the city on the Seine, the old home of Julian, had been gradually rising in consequence. It plays an important part during the reign of his son Lewis the Pious. Characteristically enough, Paris first appears in Carolingian history as the scene of a conspiracy against her Teutonic master. There it was that the rebels assembled who seized and imprisoned, and at last deposed, the pious Emperor.³ Later in the ninth century Paris acquired a more honourable renown; she became the bulwark of Gaul against the inroads of the Northmen. The pirates soon found out the importance of the position of the city in any attack or defence of Gaul on her northern side.

Division of
the Empire.
888.

Kingdoms
of East
and West
Franks.
Growing
importance
of Paris.

830.

Paris the
chief bul-
wark
against the
Northmen.

¹ Charles the Fat is commonly said to have reunited the whole Empire of Charles the Great, and he certainly reigned over Germany, Italy, Lotharingia, and West-France, but he never obtained the immediate-sovereignty of the Kingdom of Burgundy, founded by Boso in 879. Boso was succeeded by Rudolf.

² The division is nowhere better set forth than in our own Chronicles, A. 887. It is worth noticing that not one of the Kingdoms has a name. "Earnulf wunode on þam lande be sæstan Rine; and Hroðulf þa feng to þam middel rice and Oþa to þam west dæle and Beorngar and Wiða to Langbeardna lande."

³ "The City of Revolutions begins her real history by the first French Revolution." Palgrave, i. 282. (References to "Palgrave" will, for the future, mean the "History of Normandy and England," not the "English Commonwealth.")

The Seine, and Paris upon the Seine, now became the great object of Scandinavian attack. Thrice in the reign of Charles the Bald did the invaders enter the city. At last a new power was formed, chiefly with the object of defending Gaul from their attack. Paris, with a large district, was granted in fief by Charles the Bald to Robert the Strong, as a Mark or Marquisate, a border territory, to be defended against the invading Northman and the rebellious Breton. This "Mark" was destined to a career which seems not unusual for such frontier districts. In Germany the Mark of Brandenburg, her outlying defence against the Slave, and the Eastern Mark, her outlying defence against the Magyar, have, under the names of Prussia and Austria, eclipsed the older names of Saxony, Swabia, Franconia, and Bavaria. So it was with this outlying Mark granted to Count Robert by Charles the Bald. Paris now became a centre, a capital; if not a royal, at least a ducal, city. The fief of Robert grew into the Duchy of France, and the Duchy of France grew into the Kingdom. Robert himself became the forefather of the first Capets, of the Valois, and of the Bourbons. The great siege of Paris by the Northmen, and its gallant defence by Count Odo, or Eudes, the son of Robert, greatly raised the position alike of the city and of its lord. On the deposition of Charles the Fat ineffectual attempts were indeed made on behalf of other candidates, but, in the end, Count Odo was elected and consecrated to what we can no longer call anything but the Kingdom of France, a Kingdom over which his descendants were still reigning twenty years ago.

CHAP. IV.

Formation
of the Mar-
quisate of
Paris.
861.

Paris de-
fended by
Odo.
885-886.

Odo elected
King.
888.

1848.

Odo of Paris then became "Rex Francorum," in a sense which, as applied to his family, we cannot better represent than by the title of "King of the French." His own family was of German descent,¹ but, throughout the following

¹ Richer, i. 5. "Hic [Odo] patrem habuit ex equestri ordine Rotbertum; avum vero paternum, Witichinum advenam Germanum."

CHAP. IV. century, his dynasty represents, perhaps quite unconsciously, the growing French nationality. The Dukes and Kings of Paris spoke French long before the end of the ninth century, while the Karlings of Laôn still spoke their ancestral Teutonic.¹ Now sets in the hundred years' struggle between the Carolingian house at Laôn and the Capetian² house at Paris. This period falls naturally into two stages. In the first, the Lords of Paris directly disputed the Crown with the heirs of Charles; in the second, they preferred the position of King-makers to that of Kings. Odo was elected as the hero of the siege of Paris, the true champion of Gaul and of Christendom. But he soon found a rival in Charles the Simple, whose only claim was the doubtful belief that the blood of his great namesake flowed in his veins. Charles was again overthrown

Charles
the Simple
and Robert.

¹ The notices of language in Flodoard and Richer are curious. Charles the Simple has a conference at Worms with Henry the Fowler (Henricus Transrhenensis), when (Richer, i. 20) "*Germanorumque Gallorumque juvenes, linguarum idiomate offensi, ut eorum mos est, cum multa animositate maledictis sese lacessere coeperunt.*" In 948 Lewis and Otto attend a synod, where letters are read in Latin, and translated "*propter Reges juxta Teutiscam linguam.*" (Flod. in An. Pertz, iii. 396.) Lewis therefore spoke German as well as Otto. Otto however (see Widukind, ii. 36) could speak French on occasion, which makes the employment of German still more important. In 981 Hugh Capet and Otto the Second met. Otto spoke Latin, and a Bishop translated his speech to Hugh. (Richer, iii. 85.) Hugh therefore did not understand German, and the Romance which he spoke had departed so far from Latin that Latin needed an interpreter. In 996 Gaulish and German Bishops meet (Richer, iv. 100), and the Bishop of Verdun is chosen to speak "*eo quod linguam Gallicam nōrat.*" The Lotharingian Prelate could probably speak both languages. These passages seem enough to make out the statement in the text.

Sir Francis Palgrave's assertion (i. 72) that "the German Ritterschaft of Otho the Great raised the war-cry in French" is an evident misconception of the passage in Widukind (i. 17) on which it is evidently grounded. The historian is clearly speaking of the Lotharingian borderers who spoke both languages.

² I use this familiar name prospectively, as I know not what other to put in its place. I may add that *Capet* was at no time really a family name, as people fancied during the French Revolution, and ludicrously described Lewis the Sixteenth as "Louis Capet."

by Duke Robert, the brother of King Odo, who himself CHAP. IV. reigned as the second of the Parisian Kings. Charles in his turn overthrew Robert, who died in battle at Soissons. 923. The heir of the Capetian house was Hugh, surnamed the Hugh the Great, Duke of the French. Great. His career was a strange one: he refused the offered crown, but he carried himself as a King in every thing but name. He bore what to us sounds the strange title of *Dux Francorum*, "Duke of the French," and, as Duke of the French, he was a far more powerful potentate than the King of the French who was his nominal sovereign. On the death of Robert, he declined the royal dignity for himself, and passed it on to his brother-in-law, Rudolf King of the French. Rudolf of Burgundy. He next passed it on to Lewis the 923. son of Charles the Simple. The Carolingian King once more reigned on the rock of Laôn, but he found anything but a tranquil subject in the mighty Duke of Paris. The Lewis-from-beyond-Sea. 936. Duke of the French allowed himself full power of revolt, full power of disobeying, attacking, expelling, imprisoning the King of the French, of anything, in short, but avowedly reigning in his stead. King Lewis was succeeded by his Lothar King. 954. son Lothar, and Duke Hugh the Great by his son Hugh Capet. The younger Hugh, though in no imprudent Hugh Capet Duke. 956. hurry to obtain a crown, had not his father's rooted objection to receive one. He remained Duke of the French during the long reign of Lothar and the short reign of his son Lewis; at last, on the death of Lewis, Hugh Lewis son of Lothar. 986. procured his own election. The struggle continued for a while in the person of Charles of Lorraine, the Caro- Hugh elected King. 987. lingian pretender; but Hugh retained his crown and transmitted it to his descendants. The immediate results of his elevation were not very marked. The Duke of the The Parisian dynasty now becomes permanent. Import of the change. French became the King of the French, and the same Prince reigned at Paris and at Laôn. King Hugh was undoubtedly considerably more powerful than King Lewis or King Lothar; but in the greater part of Gaul the

CHAP. IV. change from the Carolingian to the Capetian line was hardly felt. To Hugh's own subjects it made little practical difference whether their Prince were called Duke or King. Beyond the Loire, men cared little who might reign either at Paris or at Laón. But, slight as may have been the immediate change, the election of Hugh was a real revolution: it was the completion of the change which had been preparing for a century and a half; it was the true beginning of a new period. The modern Kingdom of France dates its definite existence from the election of Hugh; the successive partitions showed in what way the stream of events was running, but the election of Hugh was the full establishment of the thing itself. France at last had, what till quite lately she has had ever since, a French King reigning at Paris. Gallo-Roman France now finally shook off the last relics of that Teutonic domination under which she had been more or less completely held ever since the days of Clovis. The Western Kingdom now broke off all traces of its old connexion with the Eastern. Up to this time the tradition of the former unity of the whole Frankish Kingdom had still lingered on. The two realms were still Eastern and Western "Francia;" each King was alike "Rex Francorum," "Orientalium," or "Occidentalium," as might happen. In war the two Kings of the Franks appear rather as rivals than as ordinary enemies; in peace they seem almost to act as royal colleagues, like the Eastern and Western Emperors of an earlier time. The Eastern colleague is the superior. He is often Emperor, which the Western never is; even when not Emperor, he sometimes receives homage from the Western King,¹ which the Western King in no case

Modern
France
now defi-
nitely
begins.

Connexion
between
France and
Germany
ceases.

¹ As Arnulf from Odo. See above, p. 131. So we shall see in 940 (Flod. in An. Pertz, iii. 387) the chief French princes, though not the King, do homage to Otto the Great.

receives from him. Thus, down to the extinction of the Carolingian House at Laôn, the Eastern King, the "King beyond the Rhine,"¹ remains, whether in friendship or in enmity, a most important person in the politics of the Western Kingdom. Even in the middle of the tenth century, we shall see Otto of Saxony and Lewis of Laôn still acting together in the administration of a common Frankish realm. But nothing of this sort remains after the final establishment of the Parisian dynasty; the German Cæsar is now as alien to Capetian France as his brother at Byzantium.

And another result took place. Hitherto Lotharingia, the border land of Germany and France, had held an ambiguous position between the two Kingdoms. Lotharingia was the seat of loyalty to the Carolingian house. Whenever a Karling reigned in the Western Kingdom, he found the people of Lotharingia his faithful subjects. The country retained its affection to the old Imperial line after the Capetian revolution, but its position was now necessarily changed. Lotharingia retained its Carolingian princes, but it retained them only by definitively becoming a fief of the Teutonic Kingdom. After the Parisian family were fully established in Western France, descendants of Pippin and Charles still reigned in Lotharingia, but, after a few struggles for their old dominion, they were no longer neither Kings of the Western France or pretenders to its crown, but Dukes holding their states in fief of the Teutonic Emperor.

Thus, after a century of struggle, Gaul or Western France became definitely French as distinguished from Frankish. The Romance and the Teutonic Franks were

¹ Flodoard, A. 938, Pertz, iii. 385, "Otto Rex Transrhenensis." So in 946 (Pertz, iii. 393), our Eadmund is "Edmundus Rex Transmarinus." This way of describing suggests some of those curious mediæval verbs, "transfretare," "transpadare," and the like.

CHAP. IV. now divided;¹ Gaul seceded from the Teutonic Kingdom.² We must now go on to sketch the history of the Normans in Gaul during the period of struggle, and to show how important an element they were in determining the controversy in favour of the competitor most foreign to their own ancient blood and speech.

§ 2. *Settlement and Reign of Rolf.* 911-927.

Comparison of the Danish ravages in England and within the Empire.

The progress of the Danes favoured by the

The history of the ravages of the Northmen within the Empire, and of their final settlement in Northern Gaul, reads almost like a repetition of their ravages and settlements in our own island. Their incursions into the two countries were often closely connected. The same armies and the same leaders are often heard of in England and in Gaul, and each country drew a certain advantage from the sufferings of the other. Each often enjoyed a season of comparative rest while the other was undergoing some unusually fearful devastation. The two stories are nearly the same, except that, the French story reads, so to speak, like one long reign of Æthelred from the very beginning. There is nothing at all answering to our long succession of great and victorious Kings from Ælfred onwards. That such was the case was not wholly the fault of the princes who reigned in any portion of the Empire. The power of the Great Charles had kept the heathen in awe, but it is not granted to every man to be a Charles or even an Æthelstan. When the great Emperor was gone, when the terror of his name was forgotten, the ceaseless internal divisions made his Empire an easy prey. Those

¹ *Cronica Regum Francorum*, ap. Pertz, iii. 214. "Hic divisio facta est inter Teutones Francos et Latinos Francos."

² Gunter, lib. i.

"Et simul a nostro secessit Gallia regno,
Nos priscum regni morem servamus, at illa
Jure suo gaudet nostræ jam nescia legis."

divisions were themselves inevitable, but they brought with them their inevitable consequences; the land lay open, almost defenceless, before the enemy. Indeed the divisions were actually more fatal because they were not complete; the very amount of unity which the Empire still retained proved a further source of weakness. The Empire did not at once split up into national Kingdoms, divided by ascertained boundaries, each of them actuated by a national feeling and capable of national resistance to an invader. The state of things was not unlike the elder state of things in the days of the Tyrants or Provincial Emperors. In those days each ambitious general gave himself out as Cæsar and Augustus; he aspired to the whole Empire, and he held such portions of it as he could win and keep. So now every King was a King of the Franks, ready to hold so much of the common Frankish realm as he could win and keep. Between potentates of this kind there could hardly be either the same formal alliances, or the same sort of international good understanding, which may exist between really distinct nations, each of which is assured of its own position. None of the rival Kings could feel sure that any other King would help him against the common enemy. None of them could feel sure that any other King would not seize the opportunity of a Danish inroad to deprive him of his Kingdom, or that he might not even league himself with the heathen invaders against him. It followed therefore that the invaders never encountered the whole strength of the Empire, that they seldom encountered the whole strength even of one of its component Kingdoms. The Carolingian princes, as far as mere vigour and ability goes, have been grossly and unfairly depreciated.¹

¹ Sir Francis Palgrave has completely dissipated the vulgar error which looks on the later Karlings as a line of utterly incapable Kings, like the later Merwings. No two sets of men could be more completely different both in position and character.

CHAP. IV. The truth is that most of them were men of by no means contemptible natural gifts, but that they were, partly by their own fault, partly by force of circumstances, placed in a position in which they could not use their real vigour and ability to any good purpose. Thus the whole second half of the ninth century is taken up with almost uninterrupted incursions of the Scandinavian pirates on the whole coast of both the Eastern and the Western France.

Position of
Germany.

Germany indeed, owing to the inland position of the greater part of her territory, remained comparatively unscathed. She suffered far more from the Magyars than she suffered from the Northmen. Still the whole Saxon and Frisian coast was as cruelly ravaged as any other part of Europe, and the great rivers afforded the heathens the means of making their way far into the interior of

of France,

the country. West-France, with her far greater extent of seaboard, suffered far more severely than the Eastern Kingdom. Even the Mediterranean coasts of Burgundy and Italy were not wholly spared,¹ though in those seas the Northman was far less to be dreaded than the Saracen.

Burgundy,
and Italy.

Instances
of resist-
ance to the
invaders.

Everywhere we find the same kind of devastations which we find in England. In the course of the history, we come across many noble examples of local resistance to the invaders, and several examples of considerable victories gained over them. But we nowhere find any such steady check put to their progress as marks the first half of the tenth century in England. That is to say, no Carolingian Prince was in the position, even if he had the ability, to carry out the vigorous policy of Eadward the Elder. Yet it would be unjust to withhold their due share of honour from several Kings and Princes who at least did what they could. The Emperor Arnulf in the East,² the young King Lewis in the West,³ gained glorious

Victory of
Arnulf,
891 ;

¹ See the story of the taking of Luna by mistake for Rome, Dudo, 65.

² Regino in Anno (Pertz, i. 602), and our own Chronicles.

³ On the battle of Saulcourt, see the Chronicle in Duchesne, p. 4.

and, for the moment, important victories over the invaders, and the triumph of Lewis is commemorated in one of the earliest surviving efforts of Teutonic poetry.¹

CHAP. IV.

of Lewis,
881.

The great siege of Paris and its defence by Odo have been already spoken of as among the determining causes which led in the end to the change of dynasty. But such victories were, after all, mere momentary checks; they delivered one part of the country at the expense of another; and the evil went on till it was gradually

cured by various indirect means. As in England, the Northmen gradually changed from mere plunderers into conquerors and settlers. Instead of ravaging the whole country, they occupied portions of it. They thus gradually changed, not only into members of the general commonwealth of Christendom, but into Frenchmen, distinguished from other Frenchmen only by the large share of their inborn Scandinavian vigour which they still retained.

The ravages cease as the Northmen settle and become French.

As the North became more settled and Christianized, as it began to form a political system of its own, the mere piratical incursions ceased, and no deliberate attempt was ever made, as was made in England, on the part of a King of all Denmark or all Norway, to displace a King of the West-Franks, and to reign in his stead. The insular position of Britain, the original kindred between Danes and English, the actual Danish occupation of so large a portion of the country, all helped to make such a design possible in England, while even the powers of a Swend or a Cnut could hardly have succeeded in carrying out such a scheme in France.

No attempt at political conquest, as in England.

The Northmen settled largely in France, but they nowhere occupied any such large continuous sweep of territory as that which became the *Denalagu* in England.

Scattered settlements of the Northmen in France.

¹ The *Ludwigslied* will be found in Max Müller's German Classics, P. 37.

CHAP. IV. No such large extent of coast lay so invitingly open to them, and it does not appear that there was any one Danish invasion of Gaul on so great a scale as the great Danish invasion of England under Ingwar and Hubba. The Danish settlements in Gaul were therefore scattered, while in England they were continuous. The Danes in England therefore, though they gradually became Englishmen, still retained a distinct local existence and local feelings, and they continued to form a distinct and important element in the country. But the Danish settlers in France, holding a county here and a county there, sank much more completely into the general mass of the inhabitants. Some of these settlements were a good way inland, like Hasting's settlement at Chartres.¹ Ragnald too occupied, at least for a while, the country at the mouth of the Loire.² But these settlements led to no permanent results. One settlement alone was destined to play a real part in history, the settlement of Rolf or Rollo at Rouen.

The Rouen settlement; its exceptional importance.

This settlement, the kernel of the great Norman Duchy, had, I need hardly say, results and an importance of its own of quite another sort from any which belong to any of the other Danish colonies in France. But it is well to bear in mind that it was only one among several, and that, when the cession was made, it was probably not expected to be more lasting or more important than the others. But, while the others soon lost any distinctive character, the Rouen settlement lasted, grew, became a power in Europe, and in France became even a determining power. It is perhaps the unexpected development of the Rouen settlement, together with the peculiar turn which Norman policy soon took, which accounts for the bitterness of hatred with which the Northmen of Rouen are spoken of by the French writers

¹ See Benoit de Ste. More, p. 76, and M. Michel's note. Cf. Dudo, p. 66.

² See Flod. A. 923, 930 (Pertz, iii. 379), et pass.

at least down to the end of the tenth century. By that time they had long been Christian in faith and French in speech, and yet the most truly French writer of the age can never bring himself to speak of them by any other name than that of the Pirates.¹ To this feeling we see nothing at all analogous in English history. We see traces of strong local diversities, sometimes rising into local animosities, between the Danes in England and their Anglian and Saxon neighbours; but there is nothing to compare with the full bitterness of hatred which breathes alike in the hostile rhetoric of Richer, and in the ominous silence of the discreet Flodoard.

The lasting character of his work at once proves that the founder of the Rouen colony was a great man, but he is a great man who must be content to be judged in the main by the results of his actions. The authentic history of Hrolfr, Rolf, Rollo, or Rou,² may be summed up in a very short space. We have no really contemporary narrative of his actions, unless a few meagre and uncertain entries in some of the Frankish annals may be thought to deserve that name. I cannot look on the narrative of our one Norman writer, put together, from tradition and under courtly influence, a hundred years after the settlement, as at all entitled to implicit belief. Even less faith is due to Northern Sagas put together at a still later time. The French authors again are themselves

CHAP. IV.

Rolf or
Rollo the
founder of
the settle-
ment.

¹ "Richardus pyratum dux apoplexiâ minore periit" is one of the last entries in the history of Richer (t. ii. p. 308, Guadet).

² The genuine name is *Hrolfr*, *Rolf*, in various spellings. The French form is *Rou*; the Latin is *Rollo*, like *Onuto*, *Sveno*, &c. From this Latin form modern French writers have, oddly enough, made a form *Rollon*. The strangest form is *Rodla*, which occurs in a late manuscript of the English Chronicles (A. 876. Thorpe's ed.). This was clearly meant to be an English form of *Rollo*. The English masculine ending *a* was substituted for the Latin *o*, just as in *Odo*, *Oda*, &c. The writer also thought that Rollo was a name of the same type as Robert and others, and thought that by putting in a *d* he was restoring it to its genuine Teutonic shape.

CHAP. IV. not contemporary,¹ and their notices are exceedingly brief. I therefore do not feel myself at all called upon to narrate in detail the exploits which are attributed to Rolf in the time before his final settlement. He is described as having been engaged in the calling of a Wiking both in Gaul and in Britain for nearly forty years before his final occupation of Rouen,² and he is said to have entered into friendly relations with a King Æthelstan in England. This Æthelstan has been confounded, in the teeth of all chronology, with our great Æthelstan, but it is clear that the person intended is Guthrum-Æthelstan of East-Anglia.³ In all this there is nothing improbable, but we can hardly look upon it as certain. And the exploits attributed to Rolf are spread over so many years,⁴ that we cannot help concluding that the deeds of other chieftains have been attributed to him, perhaps that two leaders of the same name have been confounded. Among countless expeditions in Gaul, England, and Germany, we find attributed to Rolf an earlier visit to Rouen,⁵ a share in the great siege of Paris,⁶ and an occupation or destruction of Bayeux.⁷ But it is not till we have got some way into the reign of Charles the Simple, not till we have passed several years of the tenth century, that Rolf begins clearly to stand out as a personal historic reality. He now appears in possession of Rouen, or of whatever vestiges of the city had survived his former ravages, and from that starting-point he assaulted Chartres. Beneath the walls of that city he underwent a defeat at the hands of the Dukes

Earlier
exploits
of Rolf.
876-911?

Rolf in
possession
of Rouen.
911.

Defeat of
Rolf at
Chartres.
911.

¹ Flodoard was perhaps contemporary with the settlement, but we have no narrative of those years from his hand. Richer, if he was very old when he died, may have been an infant at the time of the settlement, but that is all.

² Dudo, 75 C.

³ Lappenberg (Thorpe), ii. 60.

⁴ In some accounts he seems to appear even earlier than 876. Duchesne, 25 D.

⁵ Dudo, 75 D.

⁶ Ib. 77 C.

⁷ Ib. C, D.

Rudolf of Burgundy and Robert of Paris, which was attributed to the miraculous powers of the great local relic, the under-garment of the Virgin.¹ But this victory, like most victories over the Northmen, had no lasting effect. Rolf was not dislodged from Rouen, nor was his career of devastation and conquest at all seriously checked. But, precisely as in the case of Guthrum in England, advantage was taken of his evident disposition to settle in the country to make an attempt to change him from a devastating enemy into a peaceable neighbour. The Peace of Clair-on-Epte was the duplicate of the Peace of Wedmore, and King Charles and Duke Robert of Paris most likely had the Peace of Wedmore before their eyes. A definite district was ceded to Rolf, for which he became the King's vassal; he was admitted to baptism, and received the King's natural daughter in marriage. And, just as in the English case, the territory ceded was not part of the King's immediate dominions. No part of Wessex was ceded to Guthrum; he was merely confirmed in the possession of the lands which he had already conquered at the expense of the other English Kingdoms. Ælfred, as I have already shown,² though he lost as a suzerain lord, gained as an immediate sovereign by the closer incorporation of a large part of Mercia with his own Kingdom. Charles also gained by the settlement of Rolf, though certainly not in the same direct way. His immediate territories were not increased, but they were at least not diminished; the grant to Rolf was made at the cost not of the King of the Franks at Laôn but of the Duke of the French at Paris. The great Neustrian Mark was not so utterly broken up as were the Kingdoms of Northumberland, East-Anglia, and Mercia; therefore the King had no opportunity of annexing any part

CHAP. IV.

Peace of
Clair-on-
Epte.

912.
Compari-
son with
the Peace
of Wed-
more.

Advantage
of the ces-
sion to the
Crown.

The cession
made at
the ex-
pense of
the Duchy
of Paris.

¹ Dudo, 80 B. Cf. Duchesne, 34 B, 25 A.

² See above, p. 55.

CHAP. IV. of it, as Ælfred had of annexing south-western Mercia. Still Charles was strengthened indirectly. Duke Robert had to submit to manifest destiny. He had lost Rouen, and his only way to keep Paris was to enter into friendly relations with the new Lord of Rouen. The Duke of the French was therefore the chief mover in the whole business; he was Rolf's godfather at his baptism, and gave him his own Christian name of Robert. The Duke thus made the most of his loss, but to the King the transaction was a distinct gain. He got two vassals instead of one, two vassals whose relations to one another were likely often to be dangerous, and between whom it might often be easy to play off one against the other. Events soon proved that the King had gained a far more faithful vassal in the new proselyte to Christianity and French culture than he already possessed in the turbulent and dangerous Lord of Paris. At a later time we shall find the relations between Laón, Rouen, and Paris altogether changed; but, as yet, the Northmen of the Seine are the firmest support of the Carolingian throne. During all the later warfare of the reign of Charles the Simple, Rolf clave steadily to the cause of the Lord whose man he had become. The Duke of Rouen had no object in opposing the King of Laón, while, by supporting him, he might easily gain an increase of territory at the expense of his nearest neighbours.

Prominent
agency
of Duke
Robert.

The Nor-
mans the
chief sup-
port of
Charles the
Simple.

Tale of
Rolf's
homage
to Charles.

The legendary details of Rolf's homage to Charles are familiar to every one. It is a well-known tale how Rolf was called on to kiss the feet of his benefactor, how he refused with an oath, how he bade one of his followers to perform the degrading ceremony in his stead, how the rude Northman did indeed kiss the King's foot, but only by lifting it to his own mouth to the imminent danger of the monarch's position on his throne.¹ The

¹ Dudo, 84 A.

tale may rest on a true tradition, or it may be a mere invention of Norman vanity; in either case alike it sets forth the original spirit of the men who were to become the noblest representatives of the system within whose pale they were now entering. And one form of the tale possesses for us an interest of another kind. The famous refusal of Rolf thus to abase himself was made in a language which by Frankish hearers was looked upon as English.¹ That Rolf spoke English in any strict sense is most unlikely; the tongue in which he answered was doubtless his native Danish. Nor is it enough to say that any Teutonic speech was loosely called English by the French; for Rolf was speaking in the presence of a prince whose native speech was undoubtedly Teutonic. But Charles the Frank spoke High-Dutch; Rolf the Dane spoke a language which, in a wide sense of the words, might be called Low-Dutch. England was the most famous and most familiar country of the Low-Dutch speech, and the Scandinavian talk of Rolf was by his Frankish hearers accordingly set down as English.²

CHAP. IV.
Rolf said
to speak
English.

It must not be thought that the district now ceded to Rolf took in the whole of the later Duchy of Normandy. Rouen was the heart of the new state, which took in lands on both sides of the Seine. From the Epte to the sea was its undoubted extent from the south-east to the north. But the western frontier is much less clearly defined. On the one hand, the Normans always claimed a certain not very well defined superiority over Brittany as part of the original grant. On the other hand, it is quite certain that Rolf did not obtain immediate possession of what was afterwards the noblest portion of the heritage of his descendants. The *Bessin*, the district of Bayeux, was not won till several years later, and the

Extent
of the
territory
granted
to Rolf.

The Bessin
and the
Cotentin

¹ See Palgrave, i. 755.

² *Ib.* i. 699.

CHAP. IV. *Côtentin*, the peninsula of Coutances, was not won till later acquisitions.

No geographical name for the "Terra Northman-norum."

after the death of Rolf. The district granted to Rolf was probably, as in the case of Guthrum, mainly determined by the extent of his actual possessions. If, as is most likely, the Dive was the western boundary, the ceded territory answered to nothing in earlier geography, civil or ecclesiastical. It was larger than the Diocese of Rouen; it was considerably less than the Province. As a new division, it had—sharing therein the fate of Germany and France—no recognized geographical name. Its inhabitants were the Northmen, the Northmen of the Seine, the Northmen of Rouen. The land itself was, till near the end of the century, simply the Land of the Northmen,¹ a land capable of indefinite extension. So in Britain the vague description of the *Denalagu* supplanted the ancient names and boundaries of more than one Old-English Kingdom. The title of the chief is as little fixed as the name of his dominions; he is Prince, Duke, Count, Marquis, Patrician,² at the taste of the writer. In the mouths of vigorous and plain-spoken enemies his people are only the Pirates, and himself the Chief of the Pirates, down to the end of the century.³

Rolf the vassal of Charles. Exaggerated claims of independence made by the Norman writers.

There can, I think, be no reasonable doubt that Rolf became, in the full sense of the word, the vassal of King Charles. The interested and extravagant Norman writers constantly assert an entire independence on the part of the Northmen of the Seine. The land was granted, but it was granted as a pure allodial possession;⁴ the Duke of the

¹ See above, p. 168.

² I cannot but think that Sir Francis Palgrave has made too much of this last title, which is surely only a piece of Dudonian rhetoric, like the "satrapæ" and "archontes" of our own charters.

³ See above, p. 187.

⁴ Dudo, p. 83 D. "Dedit itaque [Karolus] filiam suam Gislam nomine uxorem illi Duci, terramque determinatam in alodo, et in fundo, à flumine Eptæ usque ad mare, totamque Britanniam de quâ posset vivere."

Normans, though he did not bear the kingly title, nevertheless held, as a King, the monarchy of the Norman land.¹ If anything, it was King Charles who swore fealty to Rolf rather than Rolf who swore fealty to King Charles.² All this we may safely put aside, partly as the deliberate creation of Norman vanity, partly as the inflated rhetoric of an author who was writing as the mere laureate of the Norman Court. The historian's own tale of the homage, with its real or mythical incidents, is of itself enough to upset his constitutional theories. That Rolf did homage is plain enough, and, on Rolf's death, his successor in the Duchy repeated the homage.³ But I must again repeat the caution how little of real subjection is implied in such vassalage at any time, and how purely nominal it became whenever the suzerain was weak and the vassal strong. Rolf became man to King Charles and King Charles became lord to Rolf; but the obligation, after all, amounted to little more than an obligation of mutual defence; all internal sovereignty over the Norman land passed without reserve to the Prince of the Normans. In the hands of Charles the Great or of Æthelstan such a relation as this was a reality; in the hands of Æthelred or of Charles the Simple it was a mere name. Yet Rolf did, as we have seen, prove a really faithful vassal to King Charles. No doubt his interest happily coincided with his duty. Still we can well believe that in a new Christian and a new vassal, and a man evidently disposed honestly to do his duty in

CHAP. IV.

Little practical submission implied in the homage.

¹ Dudo, 128, C. "Tenet sicuti Rex monarchiam Northmannicæ regionis." So p. 136, C. "Regnum Northmannicæ Britonicæque regionis." 110, D. 128, B.

² Ib. 84, A. "Ceterum Karolus Rex, Duxque Rotbertus, Comitesque et Proceres, Præsules et Abbates, juraverunt sacramento Catholicæ fidei Patricio Rolloni vitam suam, et membra, et honorem totius regni, insuper terram determinatam," &c. See Palgrave, ii. 361.

³ Flodoard, A. 927. See below, pp. 199, 206.

CHAP. IV. his new state of life, the sense of right and wrong, in this as in other respects, may well have been far stronger than in Dukes of Paris or Burgundy who had long been used to form and to break such engagements with equal ease.

Internal
govern-
ment of
Rolf known
only from
its results.

Of Rolf's internal government, of the laws and institutions of the new state, of the details of the settlement of the country, we know absolutely nothing. Norman tradition sets Rolf before us as the mirror of princes, as the type of that class of ruler which that age most valued, the stern, speedy, impartial minister of justice.¹ But we may judge of the reign of Rolf from its results. What Normandy became shows plainly enough that its first prince must have been a worthy forerunner of our own Cnut. Once settled in the land, he seems to have become as eager for its welfare as he had before been for its devastation. He must have promoted the general adoption, not only of the religion, but of the speech and manners of his neighbours. Otherwise Normandy could never have played the part which it did play even in the next reign, nor could his capital have become so thoroughly French as it was within a short time after his death. But of the early institutions and early internal history of Normandy all records have perished, or, more probably, no records ever existed. We have no chronicles, no charters, nothing whatever to guide us but the results. From such indications as we have we may perhaps infer that the settlement was, on the whole, of much the same kind as the Danish settlement in England.² We cannot conceive any systematic extirpation or expulsion of the older inhabitants, such as accompanied the English Conquest of Britain. At the same time we can well believe that, after so many years of

No records
of early
Norman
history.

The set-
tlement
probably
analogous
to the
Danish
settlement
in Eng-
land.

¹ See the stories in Dudo, p. 85; Benolt de Ste. More, 7146 et seqq.

² On the division of the land, just like the division of Northumberland and Danish Mercia, see Depping, i. 125.

systematic devastation at the hands of the Vikings, large districts may have stood almost as empty and uncultivated as if such regular extirpation or expulsion had taken place. CHAP. IV.

But it is certain that, a hundred years after the Conquest, there was a peasantry at once oppressed enough and powerful enough to rise in systematic revolt.¹ Though in Normandy, as in England, the condition of the private settlers is likely to have gradually sunk, still we cannot believe that any descendants of the original conquerors could, in so short a time, have been brought down to such utter bondage. These peasants must have been mainly the descendants of the original Gauls, with whatever intermixture of Roman and Teutonic elements the successive conquests of the country had brought with them. Evidence from the peasant revolt. 997.

Probably the landowners, great and small, were almost universally of Scandinavian descent, while the remnant of the original population was reduced to a state of serfdom. Probable position of the races in the country.

It is certain that there is nothing in English history at all analogous to this insurrection till we come to the great peasant revolt of the fourteenth century. This difference seems to point to a wholly different condition of the lower orders in the two countries. As regards the language of Normandy, the Danish tongue has utterly vanished out of the land; it had vanished out of the greater part of the land even before we reach any contemporary records; still considerable vestiges, strangely disguised as they are, may to this day be made out in the local nomenclature.² In Northern Gaul, just as in Eastern England, many a place lost its name, and received a new name from its new Scandinavian Vestiges of the Danish language.

¹ See further on in this Chapter.

² See Palgrave, i. 700; Lappenberg's *Anglo-Norman Kings*, 97; and, more at large, Depping, ii. 339. Such names as *Dieppedal* (Deep dale), *Caudebec* (Cold beck) are good examples. In forming local names from the proper names of men, the familiar Danish *by* often appears under the form of *bæuf*; but it is more usual to couple the Danish name with a French ending. *Haqueville*, for instance, answers to the English *Haconby*.

CHAP. IV. lord. Here and there also we find descriptive names, meaningless in French, but which are, with a slight effort, intelligible in English. These may, according to their geographical position, be remnants either of the Danish speech of Rolf and his followers or of the speech of an earlier Teutonic settlement in part of the country of which I shall presently have to speak. Of the early political condition of the Duchy we have absolutely no account. On the absence of such information one illustrious inquirer¹ has grounded a theory that Normandy had no Assembly, no Parliament, no Estates of any kind, but that the Duke, Marquis, Patrician, or whatever he is to be called, ruled without any restraint on his personal will. I confess that I find it impossible to accept a theory so utterly repugnant to the analogy of every other Teutonic people. If there be any truth in Norman tradition, the followers of Rolf, as long as they remained on ship-board, acknowledged no lord, and professed principles of the most extreme democratic equality.² However this may be, it is not likely that, as soon as they were settled on land, they should at once cast away the free institutions which were common to them with all the other branches of the common stock. And I think I can discern evidence enough that an assembly of some sort was frequently consulted from the very beginnings of the Norman state, and especially that the transfer of the ducal crown from one prince to another was effected with much the same forms as the same process would have required in England.³ At the same time I fully admit that to ascertain

Normandy
not an
absolute
Monarchy.

Instances
of the
action of
the States.

¹ Palgrave, ii. 68, 259.

² Dudo, 76 D. "Quo nomine vester Senior fungitur? Responderunt, Nullo, quia æqualis potestatis sumus."

³ Several examples are collected by Lappenberg, p. 19. The dealings of the Assembly touching the abdication of Rolf are given at large by Dudo, 90 D, et seqq. So in 85 B. we read, "Jura et leges sempiternas voluntate Principum sancitas et decretas plebi indixit."

the exact constitution of the Norman Assembly at this early time would be still more difficult than to ascertain the exact constitution of an English Witenagemót. The little light which we have may perhaps enable us to infer that it assumed an aristocratic character almost from the beginning, and that, unlike perhaps every other assembly of the kind, it contained no ecclesiastical members.¹

We must remember that we are now in the very thick of the struggle between the two dynasties of Paris and Laôn. The Norman stepped in as if sent to be the fated arbiter between the two. When Rolf made his settlement, Charles the Simple was the acknowledged King of the West-Franks; from him he received his grant; with him he entered into the mutual engagements of lord and vassal. With him and his dynasty Rolf sided, and he probably saved the Carolingian crown from utter destruction, just as we shall see that a change of policy in his successors finally decided the same controversy the other way. It must be remembered that, in the year of Rolf's settlement, the Carolingian line came to an end in the Eastern Kingdom. But the border land of Lotharingia, the traditional seat of Carolingian loyalty, refused to acknowledge the new King Conrad, and presently transferred its allegiance to the single Karling who still retained the royal title. The power of Charles was thus directly strengthened to the East, while it was indirectly strengthened by the cession to the Northmen in the West. This increase of power on the part of Charles may not unlikely have led to the conspiracy which soon broke out against him, and which led to the election of Robert, Duke of the French or Count of Paris, as an opposition King. In the wars which followed, Charles rested to a great extent on the arms of the

CHAP. IV.

Rolf's attachment to the Carolingian party.

End of the Karlings in Germany. 912.

Lotharingia attaches itself to Charles the Simple.

Robert of Paris chosen King. 922.

¹ See Depping, ii. 128, 129.

CHAP. IV. Northmen, both Rolf's settled Northmen of the Seine and the Northmen of the Loire, the followers of Ragnald, who had not yet obtained so distinct a local habitation.¹ When Robert was killed at Soissons, his son Hugh the Great, as we have seen,² refused the crown for himself. Satisfied with his title of Duke of the French, he bestowed the title of King of the French on Rudolf, Duke of French Burgundy.³ Charles was afterwards treacherously seized and imprisoned by Rudolf's fellow-conspirator Herbert Count of Vermandois, in the same fortress in which a later King of France was imprisoned by a later Duke of Burgundy.⁴ Rolf's combined policy and loyalty led him to refuse all allegiance to the usurpers. A war of several years followed between him and the French of Paris. The horrors of warfare were not felt on one side only. The Norman land was twice invaded, and Rolf's fortress of Eu—a fortress famous in the recent history of France—was taken by storm.⁵ But these in-

Rolf sides with Charles.

Robert killed at Soissons. 923.

Rudolf of Burgundy chosen.

Imprisonment of Charles at Peronne. 923. 1468.

War between Normandy and France. 923-927.

¹ Flod. A. 923. "Ragenoldus princeps Nortmannorum qui in fluvio Ligeri versabantur, Karoli frequentibus missis jampridem excitus, Franciam trans Isaram conjunctis sibi plurimis ex Rodomo prædatur."

² See above, p. 179.

³ The well known Duchy of aftertimes, with Dijon for its capital. This part of ancient Burgundy always retained its connexion with the Kingdom of the West-Franks, while the rest formed the Burgundian Kingdom of Boso.

⁴ Here Lewis the Eleventh was kept in durance by Charles the Bold, on which Philip of Comines remarks (ii. 7), "Le Roy qui se vid enfermé en ce chasteau (qui est petit) et force archers à la porte, n'estoit point sans doute : et se voyoit logé rasibus d'une grosse tour, où un Comte de Vermandois fit mourir un sien predecesseur Roy de France." There is a curious notice of Charles' imprisonment in Thietmar of Merseburg (i. 13. Pertz, iii. 741): "Fuit in *occiduis partibus* [mark again the way in which countries, having no fixed names, are described or pointed at] quidam Rex, ab incolis *Karl Sot*, id est stolidus, ironice dictus, qui ab uno suimet Ducum captus, tenebris includitur carceralibus." Both Thietmar and Widukind (i. 33) attribute to Henry the Fowler a powerful intervention in favour of Charles, which is perfectly possible, but which it is hard to find in the French writers.

⁵ On the seige of Eu (Auga), see Flodoard, A. 925. Richer, i. 49.

cursions were more than repaid in kind; a large Danegeld was more than once paid to Rolf, and levied throughout France and Burgundy,¹ and the general results of the war left Rolf in possession of a most important increase of territory. He obtained Maine and the district of Bayeux, together with a more fully recognized superiority over Brittany.² Rolf did not long survive these successes; the year of his death is uncertain; but it seems most probable that, by the consent—perhaps at the demand—of the Estates of his principality, he resigned the government in favour of his son William, surnamed Longsword.³ A change in the policy of Herbert of Vermandois had restored Charles to freedom and to some nominal measure of authority. The new Prince of the Northmen therefore paid to the true Carolingian King the homage which his father had paid before him, but which he had steadily refused to the Parisian and Burgundian pretenders.

CHAP. IV.
Acquisition of
Maine and
Bayeux.
924.

Abdication
[927 ?]
and death
[932 ?]
of Rolf.

William
Longsword
succeeds,
and does
homage to
Charles.
927.

The acquisition of the territory which this last war added to the dominions of Rolf was inferior in importance only to the original acquisition of Rouen. And it

Value of
Rolf's last
acquisition.
tion.

The way in which Flodoard (A. 923) mentions the first invasion of Normandy is remarkable. "Itta fluvio transito ingressus est [Rodulfus] terram, quæ dudum Nortmannis ad fidem Christi venientibus, ut hanc fidem cohererent, et pacem haberent, fuerat data."

¹ "Per Franciam." Flod. A. 923. "Per Franciam atque Burgundiam." A. 926. From this and several other passages we get at the sense of "Francia" in Flodoard and Richer. It excludes all the Burgundies, Aquitaine, Lotharingia, Normandy, and Brittany.

² Flod. A. 924.

³ Dudo gives the account in full, p. 90 et seqq. He makes Rolf survive his abdication five years. Florence of Worcester makes him die in 917, probably by omission or misreading of a letter. Richer seems (but compare his two versions) to kill him at Eu in 925. The one certain thing is that William did homage to Charles in 927. "Karolus igitur cum Heriberto colloquium petit Nortmannorum ad castellum quod Auga vocatur, ibique se filius Rollonis Karolo committit, et amicitiam firmat cum Heriberto." Flod. in A. So Richer, i. 53.

CHAP. IV. is only on the ground of its being the original acquisition, the beginning and starting-point of the whole settlement, that the possession of Rouen itself can be looked on as more important than the possession of the noble region which was now added to the Land of the Northmen. Maine indeed was a most precarious possession, if it can be called a Norman possession at all. The struggles for its retention and recovery, the adventures of its gallant Counts, and of the no less gallant citizens of what we may fairly call the commonwealth of Cenomannia, form no inconsiderable part of the later history of the Norman Duchy. But the acquisition of Bayeux and its territory gave Normandy all that created and preserved the genuine Norman character—it gave her the cities which are adorned with the noblest works of the days of her independence; it gave her the spot which was to be the earliest home of her mightiest son. Caen, around whose castle and whose abbeys so much of Norman and French history was to centre—Bayeux itself, the see of the mighty Odo, where the tale of the Conquest of England still lives in the pictured history which forms its most authentic record—Cerisy, with its stern and solemn minster, the characteristic work of the Conqueror's father—Falaise, immortal as the birthplace of the Conqueror himself—all these historic spots lie within the region which the last warfare of the reclaimed Wiking had added to the Norman land. Bayeux itself is a city whose history has an especial claim on the attention of Englishmen. Nowhere, out of the Old-Saxon and Frisian lands, can we find another portion of continental Europe which is so truly a brother-land of our own. The district of Bayeux, occupied by a Saxon colony in the latest days of the old Roman Empire,¹ occupied again by a Scan-

Maine.

The
Beaumont.

The Saxon
colony at
Bayeux;

¹ On the history of the Saxons of Bayeux, see Lappenberg, *Anglo-Norman Kings*, p. 2.

dinavian colony as the result of its conquest by Rolf, has retained to this day a character which distinguishes it from every other Romance-speaking portion of the Continent. The Saxons of Bayeux preserved their name and their distinct existence under the Frankish dominion;¹ we can hardly doubt that the Scandinavian settlers found some parts at least of the district still Teutonic, and that nearness of blood and speech exercised over them the same influence which they exercised over the Scandinavian settlers in England. Danes and Saxons coalesced into one Teutonic people, and they retained their Teutonic language and character long after Rouen had become, in speech at least, no less French than Paris. With their old Teutonic speech, the second body of settlers seem to have largely retained their old Teutonic religion, and we shall presently find Bayeux the centre of a heathen and Danish party in the Duchy, in opposition to Rouen, the centre of the new speech and the new creed. The blood of the inhabitants of the Bessin must be composed of nearly the same elements, and in nearly the same proportions, as the blood of the inhabitants of the Danish districts of England.² To this day there is no Romance-speaking region of the Continent in which the Englishman feels himself so thoroughly at home as in this old Saxon and Danish land. In every part of Normandy the Englishman feels himself at home as compared with France or Aquitaine,³ but in the district of Bayeux he seems hardly

its lasting
influence
on the
district.

¹ In the Capitulary of Charles the Bald in 843 (Pertz Legg. i. 426), which Lappenberg refers to, the "*Ot lingua Saxonis*" is distinguished from the "*Bagisium*." It might seem that the Saxon speech survived in some parts of the country, but not in the city. The document is a list of royal *missi* and of the districts to which they were sent.

² There would be whatever difference there may have been—one probably not very perceptible—between the Saxons of Bayeux and the Angles of Eastern and Northern England; there also is greater chance of a certain Celtic intermixture at Bayeux than at Derby or Stamford.

³ No country is historically more interesting to Englishmen than Aquitaine.

CHAP. IV. to have left his own country. The kindred speech indeed is gone; but everything else remains. The land is decidedly not French; men, beasts, everything, are distinctively of a grander and better type than their fellows in the mere French districts; the general aspect of the land, its fields, its hedges, all have an English look. And no contrast can be greater than that which may be often seen between the tall, vigorous, English-looking, Norman yeoman, out of whose mouth we instinctively feel that the common mother-tongue ought to issue, and the French soldier, whose stature, whose colour, whose every feature, proclaims him as a man of another race, and whose presence proclaims no less unmistakeably that the glory of Normandy has passed away.

§ 3. *Reign of William Longsword.* 927-943.

● Religion of Rolf. Rolf, the converted pirate, died, according to his Norman admirers, in the odour of sanctity.¹ According to the wild reports of his enemies, he mingled the two religions, and, while making gifts to the Christian churches, he offered Christian captives in sacrifice to his Scandinavian idols. Such a strange confusion is possible at some earlier stage of his career, but we need much better evidence than we have to convince us that he was guilty of any such atrocity just before his death.²

taine on account of its long political connexion with England; but the connexion was a purely political one; there are no such present traces of real kindred as we see in Normandy, and especially in the Bessin.

¹ Benott, v. 8342.

“Ici trespasse Rous li proz et li vaillanz

Od fin duce e saintisme, e pleins de jorz e d'anz.”

² The tale is told by the Aquitanian chronicler Ademar (iii. 20, Pertz, iv. 123), and M. Francisque Michel (note on Benott, v. 8349) is inclined to believe it. It runs thus—“Postea vero [Rosus, Ademar's name for Rolf, seemingly made by Latinizing the French *Rous*] factus Christianus a sacerdotibus Francorum, imminente obitu, in amentiam versus, Christianos captivos centum ante se decollari fecit in honore, quæ coluerat, idolorum, et demum

But, whatever vestiges of Paganism may have cloven to Rolf himself, it is certain that his son, William Longsword, half a Frenchman by birth, was almost wholly a Frenchman in feeling. His mother was French, but he did not spring from the union of the converted Northman with the royal blood of the West-Franks. Gisla bore no children to her already aged husband, and William was the son of a consort who both preceded and followed her in his affections. She was known as Popa, whether that designation was really a baptismal name or, as some hint, a mere name of endearment. She was the daughter of a certain Count Berengar, and was carried off as a captive by Rolf when he took Bayeux in his pirate days.¹ Her brother, Bernard Count of Senlis, plays an important part in the reigns of his nephew and great-nephew. Popa and her son seem to have stood in an ambiguous position which they share with more than one other Norman Duke and his mother. Rolf and Popa were probably married, as the phrase was, "Danish fashion,"² which, in the eyes of the Church, was the same as not being married at all. A woman in such a position might, almost at pleasure, be called either wife or concubine, and might be treated as

CHAP. IV.

Birth and education of William Longsword.

Norman and Frankish laxity as to marriage.

centum auri libras per ecclesias distribuit Christianorum in honore veri Dei in cujus nomine baptismum suscepit." But the manuscript which Pertz follows in his text does not make the sacrifice take place immediately before his death, and it is as well to see how Ademar's whole story hangs together. He makes his "Rosus" be defeated by King Rudolf in the battle of Limoges in 930; he then retreats, and finding Rouen unoccupied, takes possession. Rudolf, by the way, is called "Rex Burgundie."

¹ Dudo, 77 D. Benoit, v. 4122.

² Will. Gem. iii. 2. Of William Longsword, "Nobilissima puella, Danico more sibi juncta, nomine Sprota."

Benoit, 8872.

"Icelle ama mult e tint chere;
Mais à la Danesche manere
La vout avoir, non autrement,
Ce dit l'estorie qui ne ment."

The "more Danicus" is opposed to the "more Christianus." Will. Gem. iv. 18. "Virginem . . . sibi in matrimonium Christiano more desponsavit."

CHAP. IV. either the one or the other.¹

Her child, if it happened to be convenient, be branded as entitled to every right of legitimate birth. When King Charles' daughter died, he took her son William, Popa's son, put away Spota, and married his son Richard, when he married Liudgardis.³ This strange laxity with regard to marriage, though spoken of as something specially Frankish, is truth hardly more Danish than the history of the Frankish Kings, Merovingian and Karlingian alike, is one long record of the strangest conjugal relations. Ordinary concubinage is not what stands out specially conspicuous in the history of these Kings—nowhere more conspicuous than in the history of the Great Charles himself—is the liberty which they assumed of divorcing their Queens at pleasure, and sometimes of having several acknowledged Queens at once.⁴ William, born of a doubtful union of this kind,

William
Longsword

¹ Spota is in Dudo, 97 A. "Conjux dilectissima;" in 110 D, "matrona venerabilis," a description which, I need hardly say, proves nothing as to her age. Flodoard, A 943, her son is "natus de concubina Britannâ." King Lewis, if we may believe William of Jumièges, went a step further, and called young Richard "meretricis filium ultro virum alienum rapientia." This is mere Billingsgate, as Richard was certainly born before William's marriage with Liudgardis, though from the Roman de Rou (v. 2073, 225) one might be led to think otherwise.

These marriages "more Danico" remind one of the relation of Briseis to Achilles. She is a captive, but she receives the honourable appellation of ἄλοχος (Il. ix. 336, 340); she has hopes of becoming even κούρδιη ἄλοχος (Il. xix. 298); but Achilles' relation to her in no way hinders him from taking another wife (Il. ix. 394).

² Will. Gem. ii. 22. "Repudiatum Popam . . . iterum repetens sibi copulavit." See more in detail, Benoît, v. 7954. So Roman de Rou, 2037.

³ Dudo, 97 C. Will. Gem. iii. 3.

⁴ Of many examples I choose the strangest. "Luxuriæ supra modum deditus [Dagobertus] tres habebat ad instar Salomonis reginas, maxime et plurimas concubinas. Reginæ vero hæ erant, Nantechildis, Wlfegundis, et Berchildis. Nomina concubinarum, eo quod plures fuissent, increvit huic chronicæ inseri." Fredegar, c. 60.

was rather French in feeling than Danish. His tutor was CHAP. IV. Botho, a Danish companion of Rolf, but who threw himself French rather than Danish. distinctly into the French and Christian interest. Such an education made William conversant with the language¹ and feelings of both classes of his subjects; but his own sympathies lay with the speech, as well as with the creed, of his mother; he was more at home in Romanized Rouen than in Teutonic Bayeux. In the existing state of things in the Duchy, divided as it was between the Danish or heathen and the French or Christian party, the personal sympathies of the Prince were of the highest importance, and there can be no doubt that the French feelings and Christian convictions of William had a most decisive effect on the history of the Norman state.²

The first great event in the internal history of the Breton revolt. 931. Duchy during the reign of William is a general revolt of its Breton dependencies. This event was probably not unconnected with the general course of affairs in Gaul.

¹ Dudo gives (99, 100) a curious notice of the use of the Danish language, the force of which he himself seems hardly to have understood. William is at a conference with Henry of Germany (really with Otto). Certain Lotharingians and Saxons talk to their own chief Cono; William, by his knowledge of Danish, understands them (*Per Daciscam linguam quæ dicebant subsannantes, intelligendo subaudit*). The Saxon Duke Hermann afterwards speaks to William in Danish, and being asked how the Saxons came to understand that language, explains the fact by the constant incursions of the Northmen. Now Duke Hermann might very well understand Danish, and might speak Danish to William; but the Saxons and Lotharingians would not speak Danish to Cono. What the story seems to point to is that the Low-Dutch of Saxony and Lower Lorraine was so far intelligible to one who understood Danish that he could guess at the general meaning of what was said. Wace (*Roman de Rou*, 2377) says, "Cosne sout en Thioiz et en Normant parler." What does he mean by "Normant"? Soon after (v. 2509) he says, "Richart sout en Daneiz, et Normant parler;" where "Normant" can mean nothing but French.

² Ademar, iii. 27. "*Roso defuncto, filius ejus Willelmus loco ejus præfuit, a pueritiâ baptizatus, omnisque eorum Normannorum, qui juxta Frantiam inhabitaverant, multitudo fidem Christi suscepit, et gentilem linguam obmittens, Latino sermone assuefacta est.*" The use of *Latinus* for French, instead of *Romanus*, is unusual.

CHAP. IV. It will be remembered that, at William's accession, two Kings, Charles the Simple and Rudolf of Burgundy, disputed the crown of the West-Franks. William, as we have seen, became the vassal of Charles, and refused all submission to Rudolf. Even in finally making peace with his great French neighbours, Hugh of Paris and Herbert of Vermandois, he made it a condition that Herbert should do homage to Charles as he himself had done. It was only on these terms that he restored Herbert's son, who had been given to his father Rolf as a hostage.¹ Charles remained for some while a puppet in the hands of Herbert, brought forth as a sovereign or confined as a prisoner, as suited the ever-shifting relations of Herbert, Hugh, and Rudolf. At last the unhappy descendant and namesake of the great Emperor died in bonds at Peronne, whether actually murdered by Herbert, or simply worn out by distress and captivity, matters little.² Rudolf was now the only acknowledged King, and he soon showed himself, in one respect at least, to be worthy of his Kingdom. The independent and unsettled Northmen of the Loire had committed great devastations in Aquitaine. King Rudolf overcame them in a great battle at Limoges, utterly broke their power, and procured the recognition of his own supremacy over Aquitaine.³ It was probably this great victory won over a Norman army by a French King, a King to whom no Norman had hitherto paid homage, which encouraged the Bretons to make an attempt to throw off the Norman yoke altogether. That yoke was of a twofold kind; there was the more regular and endurable supremacy of the Norman Duke at Rouen, and there was also the constant annoyance of small bands or colonies of independent adventurers within their fron-

William's
attach-
ment to
the cause
of Charles.
His peace
with Hugh
and Her-
bert.
928.

Death of
Charles
the Simple.
929.

King Ru-
dolf defeats
the North-
men of the
Loire at
Limoges.
930.

The Bre-
tons rise.

¹ Flodoard, A. 928.

² Ib. A. 929. Rich. i. 56.

³ Ib. A. 930. "Aquitanos sibi subditos fecit." Of course this only implies homage.

tiers or upon their borders. Under their Princes, Juhel CHAP. IV.
 Berengar and Alan, the Bretons rose; they made a mas-
 sacre of the Normans in their own country, which may
 have given a precedent for the later massacre of the Danes
 in England.¹ The feast of Saint Michael in the one Massacre
of the
Normans,
Michael-
mas
 case was what the feast of Saint Brice was in the other.
 Flushed with success, they entered the Norman Duchy,
 and attacked Rolf's latest and most precious acquisition, 931.
 Teutonic Bayeux.² Alike under Saxon and under Norman The Bre-
tons attack
Bayeux.
 occupation, the Teutonic colony was a thorn in the side
 of the Celts, which they were always eager to get rid
 of. But William completely crushed the revolt, and its The revolt
crushed.
 only result was to bring all Brittany more completely
 under Norman control, and to incorporate a large part
 of the country with the Duchy. The districts of Avranches Normandy
gains the
Côtentin
peninsula.
 and Coutances, with the noble peninsula to which the
 latter city gives its name, were now added to the imme-
 diate Norman dominion.

At this point comes the first of many signs which we High posi-
tion of
England
under
Æthelstan.
 shall meet with in the course of the story, all of which
 show the high position which England held at this time,
 and the important influence exercised on foreign politics
 by the illustrious prince who now filled the West-Saxon
 throne. In this, as in every other respect, all depended
 on the personal character of the King. It was now
 exactly as it was ages later. England under Æthelstan
 differed from England under Æthelred, just as England
 under Elizabeth or Cromwell differed from England under
 the first or the second pair of Stewarts. Through the
 whole of this period, the King of the English, the common

¹ Flodoard, A. 931. "Brittones qui remanserant Nortmannis in Cornu Gallie subditi consurgent es adversus eos qui se obtinuerant, in ipsis solemnibus Sancti Michaelis omnes interemisse dicuntur qui inter eos morabantur Nortmannos."

² Dudo, 93 B.

CHAP. IV. friend and kinsman of most of the contending princes, appears as a dignified mediator among them. Through the marriages of his sisters, some before, some after his election to the crown, Æthelstan was the brother-in-law of most of the chief princes of Western Europe. He stood in this relation to King Otto, to King Charles, to King Lewis of Arles, to Duke Hugh of Paris, and to a nameless prince near the Alps.¹ On the imprisonment of Charles, his Queen Eadgifu,² with her young son Lewis, had taken refuge in England,³ and the future King of the French was now learning lessons of war and statesmanship at the hands of his glorious uncle. So now, on the extinction of the Breton insurrection, while Berengar submitted to the Normans, Alan took shelter with Æthelstan,⁴ as his father is said to have done before him with Eadward. England might, in any case, seem a strange place of refuge for a banished Armorican prince and his following. The descendants of those who had originally fled before the English conquerors now sought for shelter in the very land from which their forefathers

His connexion with most of the Western Princes.

Eadgifu and Lewis take refuge in England.

Alan of Brittany does the like.

¹ On these marriages see William of Malmesbury, ii. 126, 135. He describes at length the splendid embassy sent by Hugh (see Flod. A. 926) to demand Eadchild. Oddly enough, in c. 135 he calls Hugh "Rex Francorum," while in c. 128 he utterly confounds the whole genealogy of the Parisian Dukes.

² Her name is by French writers tortured into Ethgiva, Ogive, and what not.

³ Richer, ii. 1, 73. He was carried out in a bundle of hay or some such stuff (in fasciculo farraginis); but whither was he carried? "In partes transmarinas et prope in Rifeos." As Lewis certainly went as far north as York, does this flourish mean the Cheviots, the Grampians, or what?

⁴ Dudo, 93 C. "Ipse vero in Britannia, nec in tota Francia usquam morari ob metum Willelmi Ducis nequivit, sed profugus expetivit auxilium Alstemi Anglorum Regis." Benoît, 8834.

"En Engleterre au rei engleis
Alestan, au proz, au cort-ais,
Là se remist, là s' en foi
Deserité e mauballi."

had been driven. And at this particular moment such a refuge might seem stranger than ever. The Breton exiles sought shelter in England at the hands of the very King by whom the last footsteps of Celtic independence in Southern Britain were trampled out. Æthelstan and William of Rouen might well seem to be carrying out the same work on opposite sides of the sea. But a nearer tie of common hostility might well, at that moment, unite the Breton and the Englishman. Each was engaged in a struggle with Scandinavian intruders in his own land. Between the Danes in England and the Danes in Normandy communications never wholly ceased, and, long after this time, we shall find the connexion between Denmark and Normandy directly affecting the course of English events. The Normans and their Duke seem always to have been on less intimate terms with England than most of the neighbouring states; William stands almost alone among princes of equal rank in not being honoured with the hand of a sister of Glorious Æthelstan. The Norman historian even puts forth a claim on the part of his Duke to a dominion over England,¹ which is among the most ridiculous ebullitions of his lying vanity. Still it speaks something as to the feelings which existed between the Danes in Gaul and the great destroyer of the Danish power in Britain. With Æthelstan then, the common champion of Christian and civilized Europe, at the court which was the common shelter of the oppressed, the common school of every princely virtue, did the Breton prince, fleeing from his conqueror, seek the safest and the most honourable

CHAP. IV.
Relations
of England
with Nor-
mandy less
friendly
than with
the other
states.

¹ Dudo, 97 B. "Franciscæ gentis Principes Burgundionumque Comites famulabantur ei; Dacigenæ et Flandrenses, Anglique et Hibernenses parebant ei." Ib. D. "Non solum monarchiam, quam tenebat, regebat; verum etiam affinia regna strenuo consilio moderabat. Angli parebant ejus mandatis, Franci et Burgundiones ejus dictis."

CHAP. IV.
Restoration of
Alan.
936.

His struggles with
the Northmen of the
Loire.

refuge. At a later date, when the influence of Æthelstan on French affairs was specially great, Alan and his companions were allowed to return.¹ He received a large part of Brittany as a vassal of the Norman Duke; he appears to have remained steady in his allegiance, and he is henceforth constantly mentioned among the chief peers of the Norman state.² But he could recover the actual possession of his dominions only by hard fighting against the independent Normans of the Loire. These pirates, even after Rudolf's victory at Limoges, held many points of the country, and they were hardly more inclined to submit to the Norman Duke at Rouen than to the Breton Court at Vannes.³ Alan restored the ruined city of Nantes, and did much for his recovered dominions in various ways. The relations between Normandy and Brittany were now definitely settled, as far as anything could be said ever to be settled in that age. The

¹ It is curious to compare the different ways in which the return of the Bretons is told by Flodoard and by Dudo. Flodoard (A. 936) is willing to magnify even an Englishman in comparison with a Norman. William is not named. "*Brittones à transmarinis regionibus Alstani Regis presidio revertentes terram suam repetunt.*" Dudo mixes up their return with the return of King Lewis, which in Flodoard follows it, and he makes Æthelstan something like a suppliant to William (95 D, see below, p. 210). He calls Æthelstan "*Anglorum Rex pacificus.*" Was he thinking of Eadgar, who may have come within his own memory?

² Dudo, 98 A. "*Ipsèque Alanus postea Willelmi mandatis indesinenter inhæsit.*" Cf. 102 B. C. 113 D. 117 D.

³ Flodoard seems to imply that some of these independent Normans entered Brittany, about the same time as this suppression of the Breton revolt, perhaps even in concert with Duke William (A. 931). "*Incon Nortmannus, qui morabatur in Ligeri, cum suis Britanniam pervadit, victisque et cæsis vel ejectis Brittonibus regione potitur.*" Of the return of the Bretons he has two notices. The first is under the year 937. "*Brittones ad sua loca post diutinam regressi peregrinationem, cum Nortmannis, qui terram ipsorum contiguam sibi pervaserant, frequentibus dimicant proeliis, superiores pluribus existentes, et loca pervasa recipientes.*" The second is in the next year, 938. "*Brittones cum Nortmannis confli-gentes victoriâ potiuntur, et quoddam Nortmannorum castellum cepisse feruntur.*" See Palgrave, ii. 178—182.

boundary between the suzerain and the vassal state was CHAP. IV. fixed by the cession of the Côtentin to Normandy. It The Côtentin becomes thoroughly Norman. is probable that the cession was accompanied by a considerable migration of the inhabitants. The language of our authorities¹ seems to imply that Alan neither fled nor returned alone, but that he was followed by a considerable portion of his countrymen. In his return he is not unlikely to have been accompanied by some of his insular kinsmen, and we may perhaps be tempted to look on this settlement as a second Armorican migration. When such a process was going on, the Breton inhabitants of the ceded territory would be strongly tempted to join in the migration, and so to escape the hated Norman dominion. At all events the Côtentin, the last won part of Normandy, was one of the districts which became most thoroughly Norman. It now stood open for colonization, and we shall presently see that colonization was allowed, perhaps invited, not only from the settled parts of Normandy, but even directly from the heathen North itself.

Along with the peninsula of Coutances the Norman Dukes obtained a possession which was afterwards to form a bond of connexion of a singular kind between Normandy and England.² In comparing the extent of the West-Frankish Kingdom at this age with that of modern France in our own day,³ while mentioning many points in which the French frontier has advanced, I had to mention three points where it has fallen back. The France Normandy acquires the Channel Islands. of the tenth century, or more strictly the country whose princes acknowledged at least a nominal superior in the West-Frankish King, included Flanders, Barcelona, and the Channel Islands. Those islands, hitherto Breton,

¹ See the passages from Flodoard quoted above.

² The general line of thought in this paragraph is suggested by Palgrave, i. 106.

³ See above, p. 173.

CHAP. IV. now became Norman. When continental Normandy was lost by John, the insular part of the Duchy was still retained, and it has ever since remained a possession of the English Crown. That Crown might be said to hold it as a part of the ancient Duchy which had never been lost; or, if the Duchy was held to be merged in the Kingdom won by Henry the Fifth, it might be held to be a portion of that Kingdom retained after Bourdeaux and Calais were lost.¹ As long as the English Kings retained the title either of Duke of Normandy or of King of France, here was a portion of the Duchy or of the Kingdom whose actual possession might be said to make good their claim to the rest. This insular Normandy remains to this day French in speech and history, but deeply attached, and with good reason, to the English connexion. The Islands form distinct commonwealths, dependent on the British Crown, but not incorporated with the United Kingdom. This condition of a dependency is perhaps that which best suits a community which has a distinct existence of its own, but which could not possibly maintain its independence as a distinct and sovereign state. Retaining their ancient constitutions, and enjoying the protection of the power of England, the Norman Islands unite the safety of a great Kingdom with the local independence

Treaty of
Troyes.
1420.

Peculiar
relation of
the Islands
to Eng-
land.

¹ It may however be doubted whether either Calais or Bourdeaux could be called parts of the Kingdom of France settled on Henry the Fifth by the Treaty of Troyes. Calais, ceded to Edward the Third by the Treaty of Bretigny (1360), was rather an outlying part of England. Aquitaine, held up to the time of that Treaty as a fief of France, became, by virtue of that Treaty, a perfectly independent state. It would seem then that, in strictness, Henry the Fifth and Sixth reigned at Calais strictly as Kings of England, at Bourdeaux strictly as Sovereign Dukes of Aquitaine; but when, by the Treaty of Troyes, Henry, already Duke of Normandy, became King of France, it would seem that the Channel Islands, like the rest of Normandy, became part of the domain of the French Crown. Had the impossible connexion between England and France lasted, it would have been curious to see what would have become of these various titles.

of a small commonwealth. How much they would lose by becoming a French Department I need not stop to point out. But they would also lose, not nearly so much, but still considerably, by becoming an English County. The right of sending one or two members to the British Parliament, where, among so many greater interests, their voice could hardly be heard, would be a poor exchange for their present legislative independence. Parliament can indeed, on any emergency which may need its interference, legislate for the Norman Islands. But it must legislate specially for them, after special consideration of the circumstances of the case. The Islands cannot find themselves unexpectedly bound by some piece of general legislation, passed without their knowledge and possibly contrary to their interests. Thus the dependent condition of the Islands secures a greater consideration of their interests than they could receive if they formed an integral portion of the Kingdom. We occasionally hear of internal abuses in the Channel Islands, which are held to need the intervention of Parliament, but we never hear of external grievances laid to the charge of Parliament itself. The Norman Islands seem to be far more contented as dependencies than those Norwegian Islands which, as having been organized as a Scottish County, form an integral portion of the Kingdom. The ancient Jarldom of Orkney, represented in Parliament by a single member, has its wrongs, or at least its grievances; of the wrongs or grievances of Jersey or Guernsey no one ever heard. And this singular and beneficial relation in which these interesting little communities stand at this day to the English Crown is connected by a direct chain of cause and effect with the revolt of the Bretons against Norman supremacy nine hundred and forty years ago.

CHAP. IV.

Comparison with Orkney.

William, thus become the conqueror of the Bretons, ruled for the present as a French Prince. As such, his

CHAP. IV. French speech, French connexions, and French religion, caused him to be hated and dreaded by a large portion of his subjects. A strong Danish and heathen party still survived within the older limits of the Duchy, and the new cessions probably contained some of those independent Danish settlements by which Brittany in general

Revolt of
the Danish
party
in Nor-
mandy.
932.

Legendary
details of
the revolt
and its sup-
pression.

Geogra-
phical cha-
racter of
the two
parties.

Christi-
anity and
French
manners
supported
by a party

was so infested. Out of these two elements a Danish and heathen revolt was organized. Its leader was Riulf, seemingly an independent Danish chief settled in the Côtentin peninsula. The story, as we have it,¹ reads like a romance. The rebels rise in arms; they demand one concession after another; the panic-stricken Duke is ready to yield everything; he even proposes to resign his Duchy and to flee to his French uncle at Senlis. But he is recalled to a better mind by his veteran counsellor, the Danish-born Bernard. He then wins an almost miraculous victory over the rebels, and, for the time at least, crushes all signs of revolt. These details cannot be accepted as historical; but one or two points in the story are instructive. The rebels are made to demand the cession of all the country west of the river Risle. This boundary nearly answers to the original grant to Rolf, excluding the later acquisitions of Bayeux and Coutances. The demand, like everything else in the history, shows how thoroughly the Norman parties were geographical parties. The Christian and French-speaking Duke might keep Christian and French-speaking Rouen and Evreux; but the heathen and Danish land to the west must be independent of a prince who had cast away the creed and speech of his forefathers. On the other hand, we see that there were men of Danish birth, old companions of Rolf, men who retained a strong national feeling, who still distinctly threw in their lot with the French party. They wished Normandy to re-

¹ Dudo, 94 et seqq.

main an united and independent state; they had not the slightest wish to merge Normandy in France in any political sense; but they wished the Norman Duchy to be a member of the general French commonwealth, French in religion, language, and civilization. Such men were Botho, the old tutor of William and afterwards tutor to William's son, Oslac, bearing a name famous in our own Northumbrian history, and Bernard the Dane, who plays an important part in affairs for many years to come. Through the overthrow of the rebellion, this party was now dominant, and William reigned as a Christian prince, as a French prince, aiming at an influence in French affairs proportioned to the extent of his dominion on French soil. Through his whole life he was subject to strong religious impulses, and, according to a legend which probably contains some groundwork of truth, he was with difficulty hindered from becoming a monk in his own foundation of Jumièges.¹ Yet he was by no means lavish in grants to the Church, and the ecclesiastical foundations, which had suffered so cruelly during the Scandinavian incursions, still remained weak and impoverished, and, in many cases, altogether desolate. His general government is described as just and vigorous, and he seems to have deservedly won the general love of his subjects. And it is certain that, though he laboured to bring his dominions within the pale of Christian and French civilization, he did not wholly cast away the national speech and national feelings of his fathers. It is not unlikely that his policy towards the Danish element in the Duchy varied at

CHAP. IV.

among the
native
Danes.William's
French and
Christian
govern-
ment.He does
not wholly
break with
the Danish
element.

¹ From this scheme he was dissuaded by the good sense of the Abbot Martin. Those who care to read the Abbot's sermon on the practical and the contemplative life will find it in Latin (diversified with a little Greek) in Dudo, p. 101 et seqq., and in Old-French in Benoit, v. 11057 et seqq.

CHAP. IV. different periods of his reign. He may have found that the transformation of a nation must needs be a work of time, that too much haste might hinder the object which he had at heart, that a certain measure of toleration, in language, in manners, and even in religion, might be needful in order to bring about a final change in any of those points. In his later days he may even have gone further than this. After all his efforts to identify himself with the French, and to act as a French prince among other French princes, he still found himself scorned and hated, still looked on as Duke only of the Pirates. Under the influence of such feelings, he may to some extent have thrown himself into the hands of the Danish party. According to a story which cannot be received as it stands, but which probably contains some germs of truth, he admitted a fresh Danish colony, direct from Denmark, into the newly-acquired peninsula of Coutances.¹ It is certain that he entrusted his son Richard to the care, not of any French clerk or Bishop, but to his own old tutor, the Danish-born Botho. The boy was purposely taken to Bayeux, the Teutonic city which Botho himself, in his pirate days, had helped to ravage. He was sent thither expressly to become familiar with the ancestral tongue, which was already forgotten at Rouen,² but which was still spoken by the mixed Saxon

Towards the end of his reign he makes further advances to the Danes.

Danish education of his son Richard.

¹ William of Jumièges (iii. 9) makes Harold Blue-tooth, driven from his Kingdom by his son Swend, take refuge with William Longsword, who allows him to settle in the Côtentin till he can recover his Kingdom. Now Harold's expulsion by Swend happened long afterwards, and Swend could hardly have been born when William died. The story no doubt arises from some confusion with Harold's dealings with Normandy in the next reign, but it may very well preserve a memory of some real Danish colonization of the peninsula with or without William's permission.

² Dudo, ii. 112 D. "Quoniam quidem Rotomagensis civitas Romanâ potius quam Daciscâ utitur eloquentiâ, et Baiocacensis fruitur frequentius Daciscâ linguâ quam Romanâ; volo igitur ut ad Baiocacensia deferatur quantocius mœnia, et ibi volo ut sit, Botho, sub tuâ custodia, et enutriatur

and Danish population of the Bessin. The boy was to be brought up in a Danish city, but by a native Dane who had accepted Christianity and French manners. We may be sure that no religious apostasy was dreamed of, but William now saw that the sovereign of Normandy must be neither pure Dane nor pure Frenchman, but, as far as might be, Dane and Frenchman at once.

For the purposes of the present sketch, the internal developement of the Norman Duchy, the distinction between its Danish and its French elements, its relations to its Celtic neighbours and vassals, are points of more importance than the part played by its second Duke in general French politics. Yet the history of Normandy would be hardly intelligible without some understanding of the general position of the Duchy as one of the great fiefs of the French Crown. The reign of William Longsword forms the most confused portion even of the confused French history of the tenth century. It is a period absolutely without principles, almost without definite parties; even the strife between Laôn and Paris, between the Karling and the Capet, between the Frank and the Frenchman, is in a manner lulled as long as

Part
played by
William
Longsword
in general
French
history.

Utter con-
fusion of
this period.

et educetur cum magnâ diligentia, fervens loquacitate Daciscâ, tamque discens tenaci memoriâ, ut queat sermocinari profusius olim contra Dacigenas. "Contra sermocinari," in Dudo's language, is simply to converse with.

Benott, 11520.

"Si à Roem le faz garder
E norir, gaires longement
Il ne saura parlier neient
Daneis, kar nul l'i parole.
Si voil qu'il seit a tale escole
Ou l'en le sache endoctriner

"Que as Daneis sache parler.
Ci ne sevent riens fors romanz :
Mais à Baiu es eu a tanz
Qui ne sevent si Daneis non :
E pur oeo, sire quens Boton,
Voil que vos l'aiez ensemble od vos."

Roman de Rou, 259, say only

"Richart sout en Daneis, en Normant parles."

See above, p. 205.

CHAP. IV. Rudolf of Burgundy fills the Western throne. Every French prince sought little beyond his own gain and aggrandizement, and changed sides as often as it suited his interest so to do. And William himself added as much to the confusion as any man, by changing sides perhaps oftener than anybody else. And hardly any practical difference was made by the fact that William seems to have been several degrees less selfish and unprincipled than his neighbours. He was evidently a creature of impulse, and his impulses, if they often led him astray, often led him to righteous and generous actions. Though we cannot set him down, with his panegyrist, as a saint and a martyr, we can at least see in him far nobler qualities than any that can be seen in the contemporary princes of Vermandois, of Flanders, or even of Ducal France. Still the practical difference was slight. William was doubtless morally a better man than his neighbours, but politically he was as untrustworthy as the worst of them. His plighted faith went for as little as the plighted faith of a deliberate perjurer. Impulse led him to one course one day, and impulse led him to an opposite course the next day. He probably never was intentionally treacherous, but he did as many of what were in effect treacherous actions as the basest traitor among them all.

Comparison between William and the French Princes.

Condition of Gaul.

Practical independence of Aquitaine.

Northern Gaul was at this time divided in very unequal proportions between the King and several vassal princes more powerful than himself. Of Southern Gaul it is hardly needful to speak; of Aquitaine we hear just enough to show that the lands north and south of the Loire were aware of each other's existence, and that a nominal connexion was held to exist between them. The Aquitanian Princes now and then stooped to pay a nominal homage to the King of the West-Franks; otherwise the South moved in a world of its own, very slightly affected by

the revolutions of Laón, Rouen, or Paris. It must always be remembered that the royal city was Laón, a city close upon the Lotharingian frontier, in a district where the Teutonic speech probably still lingered.¹ The royal domain included only Laón, Compiègne, and a small territory about those towns. By the election of Rudolf, French Burgundy was of course brought into a temporary connexion with the Crown, but that connexion lasted no longer than the reign of that single prince. To the east and north-east of the royal dominions lay Lotharingia, the border land, ever fluctuating in its allegiance between the Eastern and Western Kingdoms. But the otherwise perplexing revolutions of that country may be explained by supposing that its inhabitants preferred the rule of a Karling to that of any one else, but that, when a Karling was not to be had, they preferred the rule of a German to that of a mere Frenchman. Beyond Lotharingia lay the Eastern *Francia*, the Teutonic Kingdom, now rapidly rising into greatness under the vigorous Kings of the Saxon House. Deeming themselves the true successors of Charles, speaking his tongue, and crowned in his royal city, they already aspired to reunite the scattered fragments of his Empire. Within the Western Kingdom we find three chief princes, Arnulf of Flanders, Herbert of Vermandois, and Hugh of Paris. The Flanders of those days, it should be remembered, extended far to the south of any border which Flanders has had for some centuries past. Calais, Boulogne, and Arras were all Flemish, and, in those days, Flemish still meant Low-Dutch. Ponthieu was a frontier district, with a Count of its own, whose homage was disputed between Flanders and Normandy. Of the present sovereign of Flanders it is enough to say that his actions show him

CHAP. IV.

The King's domain.

Lotharingia, explanation of its continual revolutions.

Germany.

The Saxon Kings.

Arnulf of Flanders.

¹ Richer (i. 47) distinctly calls the subjects of Charles the Simple "Germani."

CHAP. IV. to have been capable of any crime. To the south of
 Herbert of Flanders lay Vermandois, governed by the faithless, un-
 principled Herbert, himself of Carolingian descent, but
 the greatest of all offenders against Carolingian royalty;
 the gaoler, and probably the murderer, of Charles the
 Simple. His object was simply to extend by any means
 his comparatively narrow territories. More powerful than
 any other French prince, far more powerful than his
 nominal King, was the Duke of the French, Hugh the
 Great of Paris. His dominions took in the greater part
 of central Gaul north of the Loire, but they nowhere
 reached the sea. French Burgundy need hardly be men-
 tioned; on the death of Rudolf, Duke and King, the
 Duchy was split into several parts, a large share falling to
 the lot of Hugh himself. Along with these temporal prin-
 cipalities we might almost reckon the metropolitan See
 of Rheims, which constantly formed an apple of discord
 among their rulers. The contending princes were always
 striving, sometimes to thrust their nominees into the
 Archbishoprick, sometimes to appropriate to themselves
 the estates of the See. A large share of the history of
 the times is taken up with disputes about the succession
 to the Archbishoprick, taking sometimes the form of eccle-
 siastical synods, and sometimes that of temporal cam-
 paigns and sieges. In the end the temporal importance
 of the See was greatly diminished, through the loss of
 several of its most valuable possessions, including the
 famous lordship of Coucy. Among all these princes Hugh
 of Paris stands out conspicuous, alike from the extent of
 his dominions and from the peculiarity of his personal
 position. The nephew of King Odo, the son of King
 Robert, the father of King Hugh, the brother-in-law of
 King Rudolf, King Æthelstan, and King Otto himself,
 the Duke of the French never would be himself a King.
 He had no scruple against making war on the King, against

robbing him of his dominions, against assuming a complete control over his actions, against keeping him in personal bondage. He had no scruple even against transferring his allegiance from one King to another, against becoming a vassal of the Eastern instead of the Western Crown. But if he went thus far, he would go no further; he would always have a King, if only to show how much greater he was than any King; but a King he himself never would be. Three times at least he might easily have ascended the throne; but he always declined the glittering bauble that lay within his grasp. In all this there seems something like a guiding principle; and even in other respects, faithless and ambitious as Hugh was, he was distinctly better than some of his fellows. It is some slight comfort to find that a man who was honoured with the hand of a sister of Æthelstan was at least not stained with any such frightful crimes as those which have handed down the names of Arnulf and Herbert to everlasting infamy.¹

When William succeeded his father, Normandy was at war with France; that is, it was at war with Herbert of Vermandois and Hugh of Paris, and with Rudolf of Burgundy, their King of the French. But Rolf, and after him William, acknowledged no King but the imprisoned Charles. From him Rolf had received his lands; to him Rolf had done homage; to him William repeated that homage on the earliest opportunity, and he never did homage to Rudolf till the death of Charles left the Burgundian Duke without a competitor for the kingly title. Peace was made, and peace was again confirmed, without any acknowledgement of the usurper's claims. It was not till three years later, when Charles was dead, and when Rudolf, by his victory at Limoges, had shown himself

William's relation to France, (927);
his fidelity to Charles.
926-928.
After Charles' death William does

¹ I of course assume that Hugh had no share in the murder of William, a point which I shall discuss elsewhere.

CHAP. IV. worthy to reign, that William, seemingly of his own act
 homage to and deed, and without any special circumstances calling
 Rudolf. for such a course, did homage to Rudolf,¹ and received
 933. from him a grant of the maritime Brittany. This grant
 Rudolf's probably included both a general confirmation of the
 grant of Brittany. superiority of Normandy over Brittany and a special
 confirmation of the transfer of Avranches and Coutances
 to the immediate dominion of the Norman Duke. Mean-
 while Hugh and Herbert were running their usual course;
 it is hardly the duty of an English, or even of a Norman,
 historian to reckon up the number of times that they
 transferred their allegiance from Charles to Rudolf and
 from Rudolf to Charles. It is of more importance to mark
 that Herbert, at a moment when Rudolf and Hugh were
 both at war with him, did not scruple to transfer his
 allegiance to Henry the Eastern King.² At last Rudolf
 died, and now a most important change took place. It
 might not be very clear what was the use of a King,
 if his vassals, several of them more powerful than himself,
 might rebel against him and make war on him at plea-
 sure. Still, though all the princes were agreed in allowing
 to the King the smallest possible amount of territory and
 power, none of the princes were prepared to do without
 a King altogether. A Diet of election was held, of which
 some most remarkable details are preserved.³ They do not
 indeed come from our best authority, as Flodoard passes
 over the matter, as usual, very briefly.⁴ But the more
 elaborate narrative of Richer in no way contradicts the brief

Herbert
 does ho-
 mage to
 Henry the
 Fowler.
 931.

Rudolf
 dies.
 936.

Diet of
 election for
 the new
 King.

¹ Flod. A. 933. "Willelmus, Princeps Nortmannorum, eidem Regi [Rodulfo] se committit; cui etiam Rex dat terram Brittonum in ora maritimâ sitam."

² Ib. in A. "Heribertus Comes ad Heinricum proficiscitur, eique sese committit." The matter was serious enough for Rudolf and Hugh to make special peace with Henry, and to give hostages.

³ Richer, ii. 1-4.

⁴ Flod. A. 936.

account in Flodoard, and it contains nothing inconsistent with the circumstances of the case. Richer's story is at any rate more trustworthy than that of the Norman laureate. Dudo sees in the whole story nothing but an opportunity for exalting the importance of his own Duke, who, in the other versions, is not personally spoken of at all. A tale in which Æthelstan appears as a suppliant to William of Rouen may at once be cast aside as mythical.¹ The prime mover in the whole matter was Hugh the Great; thus much at least we know from Flodoard.² In the expanded narrative of Richer, we read that central and southern Gaul, Hugh's own Duchy and the lands beyond the Loire, sought to confer the Crown on Hugh himself. The Eastern part of the Kingdom, where there still lingered some vestiges of Teutonic blood and speech, some feelings of reverence for the blood of the great Emperor, favoured the election of Lewis the son of Charles,³ who was now living under the protection of his English uncle. Hugh, according to his invariable policy, declined the Crown for himself. He enjoyed the reality of royalty already, and he shrank with a superstitious dread from a title which had brought little advantage to his uncle and his brother-in-law and still less to his own father.⁴ It was on the motion of the Duke of the French that the assembly agreed to elect

CHAP. IV.

Comparison of the narratives of Flodoard, Richer, and Dudo.

Central and Southern Gaul favours Hugh; the Eastern part favours Lewis.

Hugh declines the Crown and procures the election of Lewis.

¹ Dudo, 97 D. "Audiens autem Alstemus Rex Anglorum pacificus, quod præcellebat Willelmus virtute et potentiâ Franciscæ nationis omnibus, misit ad eum legatos suos cum donis præmaximis et muneribus, deprecans ut Ludovicum nepotem suum, Karoli capti Regis morte jam in captione præoccupati filium, revocaret ad Franciscæ regnum," &c. &c.

² Flod. A. 936. "Hugo Comes trans mare mittit pro accersiendo ad apicem regni suscipiendum Ludowico Karoli filio, quem Rex Alstanus avunculus ipsius, accepto prius jurejurando a Francorum legatis, in Franciam cum quibusdam episcopis et aliis fidelibus suis dirigit."

³ Richer, ii. 1. "Galli namque Celtæ cum Aquitanis, Hugonem Rotberti Regis filium, Belgæ vero Ludovicum Karoli sequebantur."

⁴ Ib. ii. 1. "Cum Hugo patrem ob insolentiam periisse reminiscatur, et ob hoc regnare formidaret." Cf. c. 73, where King Lewis says the same.

CHAP. IV.
Embassy
to Æthel-
stan.
936.

Negocia-
tions
between
Æthelstan
and Hugh.

Lewis King of the French,¹ and to send an embassy to Æthelstan to ask for the restoration of his nephew to the throne of his fathers. The embassy passed over into England, and found the King at York.² It was the year before Brunanburh, when the presence of Æthelstan was doubtless specially called for in his northern dominions. They spoke in the name of Duke Hugh and of all the chief men of the Gauls, and prayed for Lewis to be their King. Æthelstan, somewhat doubtful of their good faith,³ demanded oaths and proposed a further conference. The King of the English hastened to the coast of Kent, and the Duke of the French to the coast of Flanders, not far from Boulogne. Fire signals were exchanged on each side, the materials being found in the wooden houses which lined the shores.⁴ Let us hope that, whatever Hugh or Arnulf may have done, Æthelstan at least made good the loss to his subjects. Several English Bishops and Thegns passed over, having at their head Oda, Bishop of Ramsbury,

¹ The combination of the elective and hereditary principles, as found in all the old Teutonic Kingdoms, is well set forth by Rudolf Glaber, i. 3. "Totius regni primates *elegerunt* Ludovicum, filium videlicet prædicti Regis Caroli, unguentes eum super se Regem *hereditario jure* regnaturum." We shall find as nearly as possible the same words in an important passage of our Chronicles (A. 1042), on which I shall have something to say in a future Chapter.

² Richer, ii. 2. "Adelstanus Rex in urbem quæ dicitur Eurvich, regnorum negotia cum nepote Ludovico apud suos disponebat." Mark the accuracy of the plural form *regnorum* (we shall come to it again) as applied to the dominions of the Emperor of Britain.

³ Ib. ii. 3. "Acsi *barbaris* non satis credens." The Persians in Æschylus call themselves *βάρβαροι*, and Plautus says, "Menander scripsit, Marcus vortit *barbarè*," but why should Richer call his own people *barbari* as contrasted with the English? Is it put dramatically in the mouth of Æthelstan, and does *barbari* literally translate *Wealas*?

⁴ Ib. ii. 3. "Secus ipsas litoreas arenas collecti, tuguriorum incendio præsentiam suam iis qui in altero litore erant ostendebant . . . Cujus [Adelstani] jussu domus aliquot succensæ, sese advenisse trans positæ demonstrabat." The passion for setting fire to everything sometimes seems to be specially Norman; here it is also English and French.

afterwards the famous Primate.¹ Before Æthelstan would trust his nephew across the sea, he demanded satisfactory oaths from the assembled French princes; otherwise he would give Lewis one of his own kingdoms, where he might reign safely and prosperously.² This was no empty boast; the Emperor of Britain had kingdoms to bestow, lower indeed in rank, but more secure and more powerful, than the nominal royalty of Laôn. The French princes swore as required; but it was agreed that the Duke of the French should be the chief adviser, or rather the protector and guardian, of the new King.³ Lewis crossed the sea, landed in the realm which was now his, sprang on his horse,⁴ and rode on amid the cheers of his new subjects. He went to his royal city of Laôn, where he was consecrated King by Artald, Archbishop of Rheims; he then went with his guardian on an expedition into Burgundy, more to his guardian's profit than to his own.⁵ He then visited his powerful vassal at Paris; but in the next year, safe on the rock of Laôn, he threw off the yoke; he declared his independence of Duke Hugh, and sent for his mother Eadgifu, seemingly to take Hugh's place as his chief counsellor.⁶

CHAP. IV.

Lewis
crowned
King.
936.He de-
clares his
independ-
ence of
Hugh.
937.

¹ Richer mentions Oda only, Flodoard (see above, p. 223) mentions several Bishops and Thegns (fideles).

² Richer, ii. 4. "Quod si nolint, sese ei daturum suorum aliquod regnorum, quo contentus et suis gaudeat et alienis non sollicitetur."

³ Ib. "Dux cum reliquis Galliarum magnatibus id sese facturum asserit, si Rex creatus a suis consiliis non absistat." The relation thus mildly described is in cap. 6 called 'procuratio.' So Flodoard, A. 937.

⁴ Richer is an excellent authority for all matters personally concerning Lewis. He got his information from his father Rudolf, a brave and trusty servant of the King. The description here (ii. 4) is highly graphic.

⁵ Richer, ii. 5. Flod. in anno.

⁶ Flod. A. 937. "Ludowicus Rex ab Hugonis principis se procuratione separans, matrem suam Lauduni recipit." Richer, ii. 6. "Rex felicitum rerum successu elatus, præter ducis procurationem res suas ordinari posse cogitabat. Unde et rei militaris administrationem absque eo jam disponebat. Laudunum itaque tendit, ibique matrem suam Ethgivam Reginam ad urbis custodiam deputat. Ac exinde quæcumque præter Ducem adoriebatur."

CHAP. IV. The reign of Lewis—Lewis From-beyond-sea—is of
 Character of King Lewis ; his vigorous and active reign. itself enough to confute the common error of believing that the line of Charles the Great ended in a race of imbecile *fainéants*, like those whom Pippin had set aside.¹ Lewis may be called ambitious, turbulent, and perfidious, but no man was ever less of a *fainéant*. His life was in truth one of preternatural activity. Early adversity, combined with his education at the hands of Glorious Æthelstan, had brought out some very vigorous qualities in his young nephew. If Lewis was ambitious, turbulent, and perfidious, he was but paying off Hugh of Paris and William of Rouen in their own coin. In truth no two positions can well be more opposed to one another than the position of the later

Contrast between the late Karlings and the late Merwings.

Karlings and that of the later Merwings. The Duke of the French might now and then put on something of the guise of a Mayor of the Palace, but Pippin and Hugh had very different masters to deal with. The nominal ruler of a vast realm, led about as an occasional pageant, and leaving the government of his dominions to an all-powerful minister, is the exact opposite to a King whose domains have shrunk up to the territory of a single city, and who has to spend his life in hard blows to preserve that last remnant of his heritage from the ambition of vassals whose territories are more extensive than his own. Lewis had to contend in turn against Normandy, Vermandois, and Ducal France, and now and then he was able to give each of them nearly as good as they brought. And, small as was the extent of the King's actual domains, there was still an abiding reverence for the royal name, which breathes in every page of the chroniclers, and which was not without influence even on the minds of contemporaries who fought against him. Still Lewis constantly had to fight for the small remnant of dominion which was left to him.

938. The restless Herbert had to be driven from a fortress built

¹ See above, pp. 163-4.

on the very slope of the King's own rock of Laôn.¹ The next year we find William and Hugh both in arms against the King in a quarrel arising out of the border disputes of Normandy and Flanders.² William was at war with Arnulf, the quarrel between these two great potentates being, if not caused in the first instance, at any rate aggravated by their differences as to the affairs of a smaller neighbour. This was Herlwin, Count of Montreuil or Ponthieu, whose dominions lay between Normandy and Flanders. Properly he seems to have been a vassal of the Duke of the French,³ but when his dominions were seized by Arnulf, he got no help from Hugh, while he got very effective help from William. By the aid of a Norman force, headed, according to one account, by the Norman Duke himself, Montreuil was recovered, and Herlwin re-instated.⁴ But greater powers than any of these were soon to come on the stage. One of them indeed figures in a rather unlooked-for way in the story of Herlwin. When Montreuil was taken by Arnulf, the wife and children of the dispossessed Count were sent over, of all the people in the world, to King Æthelstan in England. That they should have taken refuge at his court would have been only the natural course of things, but it sounds strange at first that the prisoners should be sent to the King of the English, if not actually as captives in bonds, yet at least as persons over whom some degree of watch was to be kept.⁵ The explanation is most likely to be found in

CHAP. IV.

939.

Affairs of
Montreuil.
939.Montreuil
taken by
Arnulf and
recovered
by Herl-
win.Herlwin's
wife and
children
sent to
Æthelstan.

¹ On this siege, which is of some interest in a military point of view, see Flodoard, A. 938. Richer, ii. 9, 10.

² Flod. A. 939.

³ Dudo, 103 A.

⁴ Flod. A. 939. Richer, ii. 11-15. These writers know nothing of William's personal share in the campaign, which is asserted by Dudo, 103 B. Will. Gem. iii. 10. According to Benoît, (11873 et seqq.,) the men of the Côtentin specially distinguished themselves.

⁵ Flod. A. 939. "Uxorem ipsius Herluini trans mare cum filiis ad Ælstanum Regem mittit." Richer, ii. 12. "Erluini uxorem cum natis Ædelstano Regi Anglorum servandos trans mare deportat."

CHAP. IV. the close alliance between Æthelstan and Lewis. Just now Arnulf was the friend, and William the enemy, of Lewis, and William was actually excommunicated by the Bishops in the King's interest for his devastations of the Flemish territory. That a similar fate fell on Herbert for his aggressions on the lands of the Archbishoprick of Rheims is less wonderful.¹ Æthelstan soon afterwards again appears as the ally of his nephew, even when ties equally strong might have attached him to his nephew's enemies. King Henry of Germany was now dead, and his son, the Great Otto, brother-in-law of Æthelstan, had succeeded to the throne of the Eastern Franks in the same year in which their common nephew had succeeded to the royalty of the West. After some opposition at the hands of his own brothers, the future restorer of the Empire had received the Frankish diadem in the great Emperor's minster at Aachen. But the men of border Lotharingia refused to acknowledge another Saxon; there was now again a Karling who was a crowned King; he alone was their lawful sovereign; the Saxon Duke had been chosen King of Saxony only, because a chief was needed to defend the land against the Slaves, and because the true Carolingian King was at that moment disqualified.² The Lotharingians therefore transferred their allegiance from Otto to Lewis. Their first application was rejected; a second, made by the temporal princes of the country—the Bishops clave to Otto—was accepted.³ A war naturally followed between Lewis and Otto, in which Lotharingia was ravaged by the German King. Lewis was, however, not without allies. The West-Saxon King stepped in as the champion of his Frankish nephew against

William
excom-
municated.
939.

Otto the
Great,
King of
the East
Franks.
936.

The Lo-
tharingians
transfer
their
allegiance
from Otto
to Lewis.
939.

¹ Flod. A. 939. William is excommunicated "ab Episcopis qui erant cum Rege."

² Richer, ii. 18. "Cum ejus [Ottonis] pater Saxonie solum propter Sclavorum improbitatem Rex creatus sit, eo quod Karolus, cui rerum summa debebatur, adhuc in cunis vagiebat." But Henry was elected in 918, just before Charles's troubles began, but when he had been a good many years out of his cradle.

³ Flod. A. 939.

his Old-Saxon brother-in-law ; an English fleet appeared in the channel ; but in an inland war, this naval succour could be of little avail, and nothing came of the English intervention beyond the ravage of some parts of the opposite coast.¹ A series of intrigues and backslidings now follow which fairly baffle the chronicler. While Lewis was gaining new subjects to the East, his vassals within his own kingdom almost unanimously forsook him. Not only his old enemies Hugh and Herbert, but the fickle Duke of the Normans, and Arnulf, in whose cause he had himself been so lately warring, all met Otto and transferred their homage from Lewis to him.² The motive for this course is not very clear ; Otto was indeed a more distant, but he was a far more powerful, over-lord, one far more likely to exercise effective authority over his vassals. But the indefatigable Lewis found new friends in Lotharingia, he went into Elsass to a conference with Hugh of Provence,³ he

CHAP. IV.
The English fleet in the Channel.

The French Princes do homage to Otto.

Activity of Lewis.

¹ Flod. A. 939. "Anglorum classis ab Alstano, Rege suo, in auxilium Ludowici Regis transmissa mari transito loca quæquæ Morinorum mari deprædatur contigua ; nulloque negotio propter quod venerant peracto, remenso mari, propria repetunt loca." Richer, ii. 16. "Nec multo post et ab Ædelstano Anglorum Rege classis Regi cum copiis missa est. Audierat enim illum ab iis qui maritima incolebant loca exagitari, contra quos classis dimicaret Regique nepoti auxilium ferret. Comperto vero contra Regem illorum neminem stare, ipsumque Regem in partes Germaniæ prosperum secessisse, mari remenso ad propria remeat."

There is a marked difference of tone in these two accounts. Flodoard clearly wishes to make as little as he can of the English intervention, while Richer is anxious to make the most. Nor are their statements easy to reconcile. If Æthelstan's fleet ravaged the Flemish coast, while Arnulf was still not an avowed enemy, that would at once explain Arnulf's sudden defection. But, according to Richer, it would seem that Æthelstan heard some rumour of Arnulf's intended treachery, but that, as it was not yet consummated, he had no excuse for action. That we do not hear of English interference during the next stage of the history is probably accounted for by Æthelstan's death in 940.

² Flod. A. 939. "Otho Rex colloquium habuit cum Hugone et Heriberto, Arnulfo et Willelmo Nortmannorum principe ; et acceptis ab eis pacti sacramentis, trans Rhenum regreditur."

³ Ib. "Proficiscitur Elisatium, locutusque cum Hugone Cisalpino." Richer, ii. 17. "Rex in pago Elisatio cum Hugone Cisalpino principe

CHAP. IV. drove the partisans of Otto out of Lotharingia, and returned to Laôn to chastise a Bishop suspected of treason. These successes were only transitory; Lotharingia was soon recovered by Otto.¹ But the conspiracy of the French Princes against their King was no less transitory. In the year following the general defection, William of Normandy changed sides; he met Lewis in the neighbourhood of Amiens, he did homage, and received from the King a fresh grant of his dominions.² And he seems to have made something more than the usual formal promises of allegiance. He is said to have pledged himself either to die in the King's cause or to restore him to the full exercise of his royal authority.³ Yet before the year was out, William was again in arms, helping Hugh and Herbert in a siege of Rheims.⁴ The Metropolitan See was disputed between Hugh, a son of Herbert, and Artald, a vigorous champion of the King, and who had performed the ceremony of his coronation. Artald was now in possession of the Bishoprick, and had been endowed by the King with great temporal privileges and with the title of Count.⁵ War against the Primate was in every sense

Lothar-
ingia won
and lost.

William
does
homage
and makes
special
promises
to Lewis.
940.

The Prin-
ces, Wil-
liam
among
them, be-
siege
Rheims,
and depose
Archbishop
Artald.
940.

locutus." M. Gaudet, in his note on Richer, takes this for Hugh the Black, one of the princes of *French* Burgundy, who is mentioned by Flodoard the next year. But surely the person he meant is Hugh of Provence, the famous King of Italy. In Flodoard's language, "*Gallia Cisalpina*" (I cannot conceive why) always means the *Kingdom* of Burgundy or one part of it. See A. 924, 937, 946. Lewis often had relations with the Burgundian Kings, which, as not bearing on Norman affairs, I leave out.

¹ Flod. A. 939.

² Ib. A. 940. "Rex Ludowicus abiit obviam Willelmo principi Nortmannorum, qui venit ad eum in pago Ambianensi et se illi commisit. At ille dedit ei terram quam pater ejus Karolus Nortmannis concesserat."

³ Richer, ii. 20. "Wilelmus piratarum Dux . . . Regis factus, tanto ei consensu alligatus est ut jam jamque aut sese moriturum, aut Regi imperii summam restitutum proponeret."

⁴ Flod. A. 940. Richer (ii. 22) does not mention the presence of William at the siege.

⁵ Ib. u. s. "Dedit autem Rex Artoldo Archiepiscopo, ac per eum Ecclesie Remensi, per præceptionis regie paginam Remensis urbis monetam jure

war against the King. The city surrendered; Herbert's Archbishop was admitted; and the conspirators then went a step further in rebellion by besieging the King's own city of Laon. Hugh and Herbert presently took a still more daring step by inviting Otto to Attigny, within the acknowledged West-Frankish border, and there renewing their homage to him.¹ With this last transaction William had nothing to do; before long we find him again the faithful homager of King Lewis, receiving him with all kingly state at Rouen, and seemingly bringing with him to their due allegiance, not only his own Breton vassals, but his brother-in-law William of Aquitaine.²

CHAP. IV.

Hugh and Herbert again do homage to Otto at Attigny. 940.

William renews his homage to Lewis.

We are now drawing near to the end of the troubled career of William Longsword. We here find ourselves involved in such a mass of contradictory statements that I reserve their special examination for another place.³

That William was lured by Arnulf of Flanders to a conference on the island of Picquigny in the Somme, and that he was there murdered by the contrivance of the Flemish Prince, there seems no reason to doubt. But as to the motives and circumstances which led to the act, whether Arnulf acted alone or in concert with any of the other French Princes, whether King Otto himself was in any way the unwitting cause of a crime at which his noble heart would have revolted, are questions which I shall discuss elsewhere. But I cannot, even here, wholly pass by the Council of Attigny, a Council at which events took place which one version closely connects with the death of William. Otto was reconciled to Lewis, now become his brother-in-law by a marriage with his widowed sister Gerberga, and by Otto's means the Duke of the French was

William Longsword murdered by Arnulf. 943.

Council of Attigny, held by the two Kings of the Franks as colleagues.

perpetuo possidendam; sed et omnem comitatum Remensem eidem contulit Ecclesiæ."

¹ Flod. A. 640. Palgrave, ii. 244.

² Ib. A. 942. More fully, Richer, ii. 28.

³ See Appendix D.

CHAP. IV. reconciled to the King. The two Kings then, as colleagues in the administration of one Frankish realm, held a solemn Council, at which the great vassals of the Western Kingdom attended. The Kings sat side by side, but though the Western King was on his own ground, his Eastern colleague, the truer successor of Charles, the King crowned at Aachen and already no doubt aspiring to be the Emperor crowned at Rome, took the seat of honour, which, if one tale be true, the Norman alone was found bold enough to challenge for his own immediate lord.

§ 4. *Reign of Richard the Fearless.* 943–996.

Richard
the Fear-
less suc-
ceeds.
943.

His doubt-
ful legiti-
macy little
thought of.

He is in-
vested
with the
Duchy by
Lewis.

William Longsword left one son, Richard, surnamed the Fearless, born of a Breton mother, Sprota, who stood, as we have seen, to Duke William in that ambiguous position in which she might, in different mouths, be called an honourable matron, a concubine, or a harlot.¹ Her son had been taught both the languages of his country, and was equally at home in Romance Rouen and in Scandinavian Bayeux.² Whether his birth were strictly legitimate or not was a matter of very little moment either in Norman or in Frankish eyes. If a man was of princely descent, and showed a spirit worthy of his forefathers, few cared to inquire over minutely into the legal or canonical condition of his mother. The young Richard had been already, without any difficulty, acknowledged by the Norman and Breton chiefs as his father's future successor in the Duchy,³ and he now found as little difficulty in obtaining a formal investiture of the fief from his Lord King Lewis.⁴ In England his minority, for he was only about ten years old, would have been a far greater obstacle

¹ See above, p. 204.

² See above, p. 216.

³ Dudo, 112 D.

⁴ Flod. A. 943. "Rex Ludowicus filio ipsius Willelmi, nato de concubina Britannia, terram Nortmannorum dedit." So more fully in Richer, ii. 34.

to his succession than his doubtful birth. But even in CHAP. IV. England, within the same century, minors reigned when no better qualified member of the royal family was forthcoming, and young Richard was the only male descendant of Rolf. The long reign of Richard, extending over more than fifty years, is one of the most important in the history of Normandy and of France, and it is in his time that we come across the first direct collision between Normandy and England. And the early part of Richard's reign is perhaps more crowded with picturesque incidents than any other portion of time of equal length. The early life of the orphan child, his dangers, his captivity, his escape, his bitter enemies and his faithful friends, the mighty powers which strove for the possession of his person or for influence over his counsels—the tale has all the interest of a complicated romance. Many of the details are doubtless due to the invention of Norman legend-makers; but there is enough in the soberer French and German writers to show that the main outline of the story is trustworthy. But for the purpose of the present sketch, I must set forth the romantic tale of Richard's childhood only in a greatly abridged shape, and must content myself with pointing out those parts of the story which are of political importance.¹

Reign of
Richard.
943-996.

Romantic
interest of
his early
life.

The year in which William Longsword was murdered was an important year for France in many ways. It marks in some sort the beginning of a new epoch. Besides the death of William and the important events which followed upon it, this year was marked by a birth and a death which had no small influence on the course of affairs.

Events of
the year
943;

¹ The original authority, such as it is, for these stories is, of course, Dudo, with the metrical chroniclers, who mainly follow him, Benoît sometimes adding details of his own. The English reader will find all he can want in Sir Francis Palgrave. I cannot help also mentioning Miss Yonge's tale of the "Little Duke," where the whole legend is very pleasantly told, though with too great a leaning to the Norman side.

CHAP. IV. Herbert of Vermandois, the regicide, the tyrant as he is called, died this year, and died, according to one account, in a mysterious and horrible fashion.¹ His dominions were divided among his sons, except some portions which passed into the hands of Hugh of Paris. The royal power thus lost one of its most formidable enemies, while another yet more formidable was still further strengthened. And this year, for the first time, Hugh had a son to be the heir of his greatness. His English wife Eadhild had died childless; but her successor, Hugh's third wife, Hadwisa, daughter of King Henry and sister of King Otto and Queen Gerberga, now bore him a son, Hugh, surnamed Capet, the future King. One can hardly doubt that the birth of his son had an effect on Hugh the Great's policy. He would not be a King himself, but he would put no hindrance in the way of his son being a King. From this time onwards the opposition between the two dynasties, between the old and the new, between the Frank and the Frenchman, between Laón and Paris, becomes even more sharp and marked than before.

From this time onwards also we must remark another tendency which was doubtless closely connected with the one just mentioned, and of which we have already seen the beginning. I mean the continued and constantly strengthening influence of Germany, the Eastern Kingdom, in the affairs of the Western France. The Council of Attigny, with the two Kings of the Franks sitting and acting as colleagues, was but the first of a long series of assemblies of the like kind. It is to Otto that all parties appeal as their natural mediator; the King appeals to him as his natural protector. If he receives no formal homage as over-lord, still he is clearly looked on, both by Lewis and by Hugh, as something more than a mere neighbour and brother. Towards Lewis, Otto appears as the

¹ Richer, ii. 37. R. Glaber, i. 3.

senior colleague in a common office; in the language of the elder Empire, the Saxon acts as the Augustus, while the Frank is only the Cæsar.¹ While Otto is absent on distant expeditions, his vice-gerent in Lotharingia, Duke Conrad² or Archbishop Bruno, is competent to act in his name as moderator of the Western realm. This sort of relation between the two states lasted during the whole remainder of the reign of Otto the Great, that is, during the rest of the reign of Lewis and the minority and early reign of his son Lothar. But between the two cousins, Otto the Second and Lothar, the state of things was very different from that which had existed between the brothers-in-law, Lewis and the elder Otto. Lothar contrived completely to forfeit the protection of Germany, nor was Germany, if so disposed, any longer so well able to afford protection. Here was one determining cause of the fall of the dynasty. The royalty of Laôn was an outpost of the Teutonic interest in the Western realm. Without the support of the Teutonic powers to the East of it, there was no chance of its standing. But there was another determining cause of its fall with which we have here more immediately to do. Under Rolf, Normandy had stuck faithfully to the King; under William, it had fluctuated backwards and forwards between King and Duke. Under Richard, Normandy, becoming every day more French and more feudal, became, both in its policy and through actual feudal ties, permanently attached to the Duke, and therefore commonly hostile to the King.

CHAP. IV.

From 942
[Attigny]
to 973
[Death of
Otto].

Lothar
forfeits
the Ger-
man pro-
tection.

Normandy
under
Richard
attached
to Ducal
France.

Great disturbances in Normandy followed on the unlooked-for death of William Longsword. A new invasion

Events
following
the death
of William.
943.

¹ See above, pp. 180, 232.

² On the influence of Conrad, see Flodoard, A. 948, 949, 952. Richer, ii. 82, 97. Conrad afterwards lost his Duchy. Bruno, Archbishop and Duke, brother of Otto, brother-in-law of Lewis and Hugh the Great, uncle of Lothar and Hugh Capet, plays a most important part somewhat later.

CHAP. IV. or settlement direct from the North seems to have been contemporary with the Duke's murder; it may even possibly have happened without the Duke's consent.¹ At any rate the heathen King Sihtric now sailed up the Seine with a fleet, and was at once welcomed by the Danish and heathen party in the country. Large numbers of the Normans, under a chief named Thurmod, fell away from Christianity, and it appears that the young Duke himself was persuaded or constrained to join in their heathen worship.² In such a state of things we can neither wonder at nor blame the Christian party in Normandy if they draw as close as they could to their Christian neighbours, even at some risk to the independence of the Duchy. To become subjects either of the King of the French or of the Duke of the French was better than to be eaten up by heathen sea-kings. Nor are we entitled to be unduly hard on either King or Duke for trying to make the most of such an opportunity for recovering the ground which they had lost. The Land of the Normans had been given up to Rolf by the joint act of its immediate ruler, the father of the present Duke, and of its over-lord, the father of the present King. The grant had been made on the express condition that the Normans should become members of a Christian and Frankish commonwealth. If heathen invasions were to begin again, and to be powerfully helped by men settled on Gallic soil, the Norman Duchy was serving an object exactly opposite to that for which it was instituted. In such a case both Duke and

New Danish settlement under Sihtric.

The Danes joined by the heathen party in Normandy.

Apostasy of young Richard.

The Christian party in Normandy seek French help.

Position of Lewis and Hugh towards Normandy.

¹ See above, pp. 211, 216,

² Flod. A. 943. Richer, ii. 35. The Norman writers pass over their Duke's apostasy, which of course proves very little as to the personal disposition of such a child, though it proves a great deal as to the general state of things in the country. But Flodoard and Richer are both explicit. "Turmodum Nortmannum, qui ad idolatriam gentilemque ritum reversus, ad hæc etiam filium Willelmi aliosque cogeabat." (Flod.) "Ut . . . defuncti Ducis filium ad idolatriam suadeant, ritumque gentilem inducant." (Richer.)

King might well feel themselves justified in getting rid of the nuisance altogether. Feudal ideas also were fast developing, and King Lewis may have already begun to entertain some dim notion of wardship over the fief of a minor vassal as a right of necessity appertaining to the Lord. In any case, neither Hugh nor Lewis was indisposed to extend his dominions, and at first a large party in the Duchy seemed ready to welcome either of them. The Christian Normans were divided between the contending attractions of the King and the Duke. The Duke, nearer and more powerful, could give the most effectual aid at the moment; the King, more distant, would be less dangerous as a permanent protector, and the kingly title still commanded a feeling of deep, if vague and unreasoning, veneration. Some of the Norman chiefs therefore commended themselves to King Lewis and others to Duke Hugh. This choice of different protectors seems to mark a difference of feeling among the Normans themselves,¹ but the relations of King and Duke were just now unusually friendly, and no immediate dissension seems to have arisen between them on this account. It was in this same year, though later than these Norman transactions, that Hugh not only acted as godfather to a daughter of the King's, but was confirmed by his new spiritual brother in the possession of the Duchies of France and Burgundy.² Hugh entered Normandy, fought several battles with the heathens and apostates, and was willingly

CHAP. IV.

The Christians commend themselves, some to Hugh, some to Lewis.

Lewis and Hugh both enter Normandy.

¹ Flod. A. 943. "Quidam principes ipsius se Regi committunt, quidam vero Hugoni Duci." Richer, ii. 34. "Potiores quoque qui cum adolescentulo accesserant, per manus et sacramentum Regis fiunt. . . . Alii vero Nortmannorum, *Richardum ad Regem transisse indignantes*, ad Hugonem Ducem concedunt."

² Flod. u. s. "Rex ei ducatum Franciæ delegavit, omnemque Burgundiam ipsius ditioni subjecit." Richer (ii. 39) says, "Eum Rex omnium Galliarum Ducem constituit." This last cannot have been a formal title; it is merely Richer's characteristic way of affecting classical language in his geography.

CHAP. IV. Lewis de-
feats the
heathens
and occu-
pies Rouen.

received at Evreux, where the citizens were of the Christian party.¹ Meanwhile the King marched to Rouen, gathered what forces he could, seemingly both from among his own subjects and from among the Christian Normans, fought a battle, utterly defeated the heathens, killed Thurmod with his own hand, recovered the young Duke, and left Herlwin of Montreuil as his representative at Rouen.² On a later visit to Rouen, he received the cession of Evreux from Hugh.³ Herlwin now waged war against Arnulf with some success, for he slew Balzo, the actual murderer of William, and sent his hands as a trophy to the Norman capital.⁴ But in the course of the year Hugh contrived to reconcile Arnulf to the King,⁵ and the King reconciled Arnulf and Herlwin.

Norman version.

Such is the account given by the French writers; the Normans fill up the story with many additional details.⁶ They leave out—thereby throwing the greatest doubt upon the trustworthiness of their own story—all about the homage of Richard and the other Normans, all about Sihtric and Thurmod and the deliverance of Normandy by Lewis himself. Lewis, according to them, came of his own accord to Rouen after the death of William, and was received with joy, as he was supposed to have come in order to plan an expedition against the common enemy

¹ Flod. A. 943. "Hugo Dux Francorum crebras agit cum Nortmannis, qui pagani advenerant, vel ad paganismum revertebantur, congressiones; a quibus peditum ipsius Christianorum multitudo interimitur at ipse nonnullis quoque Nortmannorum interfectis ceterisque actis in fugam, castrum Ebroas faventibus sibi qui tenebant illud Nortmannorum Christianis, obtinet." Richer does not mention this.

² Flod. u.s. Richer, ii. 35. The account of the battle is much fuller in Richer.

³ Flod. A. 943.

⁴ Richer, ii. 38.

⁵ Flod. A. 943. "Hugo Arnulfum cum Rege pacificavit, cui Rex infensus erat ob necem Willelmi." Rich. ii. 40.

⁶ Dudo, 114 et seqq. Benoît, 12809 et seqq. Roman de Rou, 2799 et seqq.

Arnulf.¹ Still from this point it is just possible to patch the two narratives together, though I confess that I receive every detail which comes clothed in the rhetoric of Dudo with very great suspicion. Lewis then, according to this account, remains at Rouen, and a suspicion gets afloat that he is keeping the young Duke a prisoner, and designs to seize on Normandy for himself. A popular insurrection follows, which is only quelled by the King producing Richard in public and solemnly investing him with the Duchy.² After this, strange to say, the Norman regents, Bernard the Dane, Oslac, and Rudolf surnamed Tosta, are won over by the craft of Lewis to allow him to take Richard to Laôn and bring him up with his own children. The King is then persuaded by the bribes of Arnulf to treat Richard as a prisoner, and even to threaten him with a cruel mutilation.³ By an ingenious stratagem of his faithful guardian Osmund, the same by which Lewis himself had been rescued in his childhood from Herbert of Vermandois,⁴ Richard is saved from captivity, and carried to the safe-keeping of his great-uncle, Bernard of Senlis. A mass of perfidious and unintelligible diplomacy now follows in the Norman accounts, of which, if it ever happened at all, we get only the results in the French version. The French writers know nothing of the cap-

CHAP. IV.

 Richard's
detention
at Laôn.

 Richard's
escape.

¹ Dudo, 114 C. "Rotomagum properavit cum suis comitibus super his quæ nefario Arnulfi Comitibus astu acciderant consulturus. Rotomagenses vero adventu Regis Ludovici hilares susceperunt eum volenter, putantes ut equitaret super Flandrenses," &c.

² Ib. 115 C. "Richardus prædignæ innocentie puero largitus est terram hæreditario avi patrisque jure possidendam." Is not this a repetition of the real grant and homage mentioned above, which did not take place at Rouen?

³ "Poplites coquere." Dudo, 117 B. "Poplites adurere." Will. Gem. iv. 3. See M. Francisque Michel's note on Benott, 13706.

⁴ That is, he was carried out in a truss of hay. One can hardly avoid the suspicion that this is the story of Lewis' own deliverance, perhaps itself legendary, turning up in another shape.

CHAP. IV. tivity of young Richard, and they connect the invasion
 Norman of Normandy which undoubtedly took place in the next
 invasion of year, with certain transactions in Brittany. The Breton
 Brittany. 944. princes, Berengar and Alan, were at variance between
 themselves, which gave opportunity for a desolating in-
 vasion of the Normans, seemingly the heathen or apostate
 Lewis in- Normans.¹ Lewis now invaded Normandy in concert
 vades Nor- with Hugh. The Duke had already made peace with
 mandy in the Normans,² but he was seduced by the offer of all
 concert with Hugh. Normandy beyond the Seine,³ or, at any rate, of the dis-
 944. trict of Bayeux.⁴ Lewis accordingly, with Arnulf and
 Herlwin, and several Bishops of France and Burgundy,
 entered Normandy and occupied Rouen. We again find a
 division of parties in the country, some receiving the King,
 and others opposing him.⁵ Hugh meanwhile occupied
 Bayeux, but Lewis, finding himself in possession of Rouen,
 demanded the city of his confederate. The Duke gave it
 up, but at once began again to plot against his sovereign.⁶
 Dissensions between Lewis and Hugh. He now stirred up several smaller enemies against Lewis,
 such as Bernard of Senlis, Theobald, Count of Tours,
 Blois, and Chartres—of whom we shall hear again—the

¹ Flod. A. 944. He seems to distinguish "*Nortmanni cum quibus pactum inierant*" from "*Nortmanni qui nuper a transmarinis venerant regionibus.*" Cf. Richer, ii. 41.

² Flod. A. 944. "*Hugo Dux Francorum pactum firmat cum Nortmannis, datis utrimque et acceptis obsidibus.*"

³ Dudo, 120 B, D.

⁴ Flod. A. 944. "*Baiocas . . . civitatem . . . quam Rex ei dederat, si eum ad subjiendam sibi hanc Nortmannorum gentem adjuvaret.*"

⁵ Ib. A. 944. "*Rex Rodomum perveniens à Nortmannis in urbe suscipitur, quibusdam mare petentibus qui eum nolebant recipere, cæteris omnibus sibi subjugatis.*" Richer, ii. 42. "*Rex Rhodomum veniens, ab iis qui fidei servatores fuere exceptus est. Desertores vero mare petentes, amoliti sunt, municipia vero copiis munita reliquere.*"

⁶ Flod. A. 944. "*Unde et discordiæ fomes inter Regem concitatur et Ducem.*" From Flodoard it would appear that Hugh had fought with some Normans, and from Richer that he received the homage of others, earlier in the year. Hugh's policy was always double, and Normandy was now very much divided against itself.

Vermandois princes, and Hugh, his own Archbishop of Rheims. Lewis meanwhile felt himself so secure in Normandy that he employed Norman troops against these various enemies,¹ and, when he had made a truce with Hugh and had raised the siege of Rheims, he returned to Rouen, almost as if he intended to make that city his capital and his permanent residence.²

CHAP. IV.
War at
Rheims
and else-
where.
945.

Lewis had first appeared in Normandy as a deliverer. But, according to the Norman writers, he now changed into a conqueror, and began to contemplate the exercise of the extremest rights of conquest. The lands and the women of Normandy were to be distributed among his French followers; above all, the estates of the aged Bernard and his beautiful young wife were to be given to an impudent knight who asked for them.³ It is worth noticing that, both in this case and in the former one, the evil deeds attributed to Lewis are all in intention; in the earlier tale, he was going to make Richard a prisoner, he was going to mutilate him; so he is now going to give Bernard's wife to his follower; but it does not appear that he actually did any one of these things. Still we can well believe that the Normans were tired of Lewis' prolonged sojourn at Rouen. French dominion in any shape would soon become hateful to the Norman nation, and all creeds and parties would gladly unite in an effort to get rid of it. That Lewis fully intended to keep Normandy can hardly be doubted. That great Duchy, with its seven Bishop-ricks, its flourishing capital, its fields and towns and harbours all springing into new life after their recovery from Scandinavian devastation, must indeed have been a

Lewis at
Rouen.

His grow-
ing un-
popularity
and pro-
bable de-
signs on
Normandy.

¹ Flod. A. 945. "Rex Ludowicus collecto secum Nortmannorum exercitu, Veromandensem pagum depredatus." So Richer, ii. 44.

² Richer, ii. 47. "Rhodomum rediit, nil veritus cum paucis illic immorari, cum idem consueverit."

³ Dudo, 122 C.

CHAP. IV. tempting prize to the King of Laôn and Compiègne. If he could not hold both Rouen and Laôn, he might be well pleased to make the exchange, and to transfer his dominions altogether to the banks of the Seine. How far any part of the Norman people was really prepared for such a transfer, how far Lewis was deceived by the false representations of men who only pretended to wish for it, it is impossible to determine. But we can well believe that all Normandy was, before long, united in hostility to the foreign King. And, whether by invitation or by accident, a most powerful and faithful ally was ready at hand to help the Normans in their struggle for independence.

Harold
King of
the Danes,
[935-985,]
son of
Gorm.
[840-935 ?]

Denmark, like Sweden and Norway, had, in this age, out of a collection of small principalities, become a single powerful Kingdom. Gorm the Old, the founder of the Danish monarchy, had died, after a reign said to have been of extraordinary length,¹ and had passed on his dominion to his son Harold, surnamed *Blaatand*, Blue-tooth or Black-tooth. Harold was still a heathen; in later times he became a compulsory convert to Christianity; but, when he had once embraced the faith, he clave stedfastly to it, and lost his crown and life on behalf of his new creed.² And, if we can at all trust the account of Harold's conduct in Norman affairs, as given by the Norman writers, it is easy to see that, in his case at least, the seed of the Gospel was sown in the fruitful field of an honest and good heart.³ The

974.

985.

¹ The chronology of Gorm's reign is of course mythical; some give him quite a short reign; others make two or three Gorms. In short, we have hardly any standing-ground in Danish history before the time of Swend.

² See above, p. 216, for the rebellion of his son Swend, which the later Norman writers misplace. Of Swend I shall have much to say in my next Chapter.

³ I may for once quote an "Apostropha" of Dudo, 125 D.

"O pius, prudens, bonus, et modestus;
Fortis et constans, sapiensque, justus,

heathen Sea-King, utterly unlike most of his tribe, set an example of straightforward, honest, and disinterested dealing, which shines all the brighter from its contrast with the endless aggressions and backslidings of the selfish and faithless princes of France. Whatever brought Harold into Normandy, he acted there as a disinterested friend of the Norman Duke and his subjects. He first appeared in the Côtentin, which was most probably already occupied by recent settlers from the North,¹ and he made his head-quarters at Cherbourg—the borough of Cæsar. He was next received at Bayeux,² and now all Normandy rose in the cause of the deliverer. That Harold defeated Lewis in battle on the banks of the Dive is allowed on both sides; that the battle was preceded by a conference is allowed on both sides. But the French writers represent the battle as a treacherous attack made by the Danes on a prince who had come in all confidence to a peaceful meeting.³ The Normans, on the other hand, say that the fight was brought about by the imprudence or insolence of Herlwin of Montreuil.⁴ He who had caused, however innocently, the death of Wil-

CHAP. IV.

Harold's disinterested conduct in Normandy. 945.

He occupies the Côtentin,

and Bayeux.

Battle by the Dive.

Dives, insignis, locuplesque, sollers
Rex Haygrolde.

Quamvis haut sis chrismate delibutus,
Et sacro baptismate non renatus :
En vale, salveque, et aucto semper
In deitate."

¹ See above, p. 216.

² Flod. A. 945. "Haigroldus Nortmannus qui Baiocis præerat." So Richer, ii. 47.

³ Flod. u. s. Richer, u. s. This last writer brings in Hugh the Great as an accomplice. "Dolus apud Ducem a transfugis paratus, qui ante latuerat, ortâ opportunitate ex raritate militum, in apertum erupit. Nam dum tempestivus adveniret, ab Hagroldo qui Baiocensibus præerat, per legationem suasoriam accersitus, Bajocas cum paucis ad accersientem, utpote ad fidelem quem in nullo suspectum habuerat, securus accessit. Barbarus vero militum inopiam intuitus cum multitudine armatorum Regi incantus aggreditur."

⁴ Dudo, 123 C, D.

CHAP. IV. liam, he who had ruled in Rouen as the deputy of Lewis, now appeared prominently in the French ranks, and stirred up the wrath of Danes and Normans by his presence. This certainly seems a very lame story, and we may well believe that Harold, however faithful to his allies, might see no crime in practising a little of the usual Danish treachery towards an enemy. But the result of the battle is certain; the French were defeated, and their King was taken prisoner.¹ The Normans add that Harold and Lewis met, man to man and King to King, and that the Dane led away the Frank as the prize of his own personal prowess. Lewis however escaped; he was accompanied, perhaps betrayed, by a Norman in whom he trusted, and, on reaching Rouen, he was imprisoned by other Normans in whom he trusted also. The Danish King, if we can trust a tale of such unparalleled generosity, had now done his work. He passed through the land, confirming the authority of the young Duke, and restoring the Laws of Rolf.² This last phrase is one which meets us constantly in our own history. After the Norman Conquest, the demand for the Laws of King Eadward is familiar to every one, and in earlier times we read of demands for the Laws of Eadgar or of Cnut, or whoever was the last King who was looked back to with any affection.³ What is really meant in all such cases is, not so much any actual enactments as good administration instead of bad, often native administration in-

Lewis defeated and taken prisoner.

Harold settles the affairs of the Duchy and returns to Denmark.

The renewal of "Rolf's Law."

¹ Flod. A. 945. "Rex solus fugam iniit, prosequente se Nortmanno quodam sibi fideli. Cum quo Rodomum veniens, comprehensus est ab aliis Nortmannis quos sibi fideles esse putabat, et sub custodia detentus."

² Dudo, 125 D. "Jura legesque et statuta Rollonis Ducis tenere per omnia cogebat."

³ In Cnut's time (Chron. A. 1018) the Witan at Oxford renewed "Eadgar's Law;" so Harold, in answer to the demands of the Northumbrians in revolt against Tostig (Chron. A. 1065), "renewed Cnut's Law."

stead of foreign. The renewal of Rolf's Law meant the wiping out of all traces of the French dominion. Harold then sailed away to his own islands; twenty years afterwards, unless the one story is a repetition of the other, he was equally able and willing to come again on the same errand.¹ CHAP. IV.

King Lewis was thus a prisoner, as his father had been before him. After a certain amount of the usual treacherous diplomacy,² he was transferred from the hands of the Normans to those of their ally the Duke of the French. His wrongs called forth the indignation of his kinsmen in other lands. Queen Gerberga sought help alike from her own Old-Saxon brother and from her husband's West-Saxon uncle. Æthelstan the Glorious was no more, but he had handed on his sceptre to a worthy successor in Eadmund the Magnificent. An English Embassy haughtily demanded the release of the King, and received from Hugh as haughty a refusal. The Duke of the French would do nothing for fear of the threats of the English.³ How Eadmund would have

Lewis kept
in prison
by Hugh.
945-6.

Interven-
tion of
Eadmund.
946.

¹ I confess that, once or twice, in writing this paragraph, a doubt has crossed my mind whether "Haigrold who commanded at Bayeux" was not, after all, some much smaller person than Harold King of the Danes. The Northern writers, as far as I know, do not mention the expedition, the motive of which is not very obvious. But very little can be made out of the Northern stories in any case; the French writers always slur over everything Norman; and the fiction would seem almost too bold even for Norman invention. The details of course cannot be accepted in any case.

² Flod. A. 945. Richer, ii. 48. Widukind, ii. 39. "Hluthowicus Rex a ducibus suis [Hugh?] circumventus, et a Northmannis captus, consilio Hugonis Lugdunum [confusedly for *Laudunum*, which is itself an error] missus custodiæ publicæ traditur. Filium autem ejus natu majorem Karlomannum Northmanni secum duxerant Rothun; ibi et mortuus est." On the hostages, see Flodoard and Richer.

³ Richer, ii. 49, 50. "Ob minas Anglorum nil se facturum; ipsos, si veniant, quid in armis Galli valeant promptissime experturos; quod si

CHAP. IV. followed up this beginning it is hard to say; but the next year saw him cut off by the assassin's dagger, and his successor Eadred had enough to do in the renewed and final struggle with the Northumbrian Danes. The application to Otto was more effectual. The King of the East-Franks at once determined to invade the Western Kingdom the next year.¹ He refused a personal conference with Hugh, and the conference which he allowed him to have with Conrad of Lotharingia was fruitless.² At last, when the German army was actually assembling, Hugh found it necessary to come to terms with his royal prisoner.³ Hugh's terms were simple—Freedom in exchange for Laôn. After a while, Lewis brought himself to surrender his single stronghold, his own royal city, which was still held for him by his faithful and stout-hearted Queen. The Duke of the French took possession of the City of the Rock, and the King of the French was reduced to be little more than King of Compiègne. Most likely he hoped, through German and English help, soon to be again King, not only of Laôn, but of Paris and Rouen as well. And, as far as forms and words and outward homage went, his authority was presently restored over the whole Kingdom. Duke Hugh did not scruple to deprive his sovereign of liberty and

Interven-
tion of
Otto.
945.

Lewis ob-
tains his
liberty in
exchange
for the
cession of
Laôn.
946.

Lewis'
Kingship
renewed.

formidine tacti non veniant, pro arrogantiae tamen illatione, Gallorum vires quandoque cognituros et insuper poenam luituros. Iratus itaque legatos expulit." Flodoard, contrary to the remark made in p. 229, is less excited against insular intervention.

¹ Widukind, ii. 39. "Audiens autem Rex, super fortunâ amici satis doluit, imperavitque expeditionem in Gallia contra Hugonem in annum secundum."

² Flod. A. 945. "Qui Rex nolens loqui cum eo mittit ad eum Conradum Ducem Lothariensium. Cum quo locutus Hugo, infensus Othoni Regi revertitur."

³ Flod. A. 946. Richer, ii. 51. Richer clearly connects the liberation of Lewis with the negotiations with Otto. Widukind (iii. 2) is still more explicit. "Certus autem factus de adventu Regis Huga, timore quoque perterritus, dimisit Hluthowicum."

dominion, but he would never be a King himself, and he would always have a King over him. The royal dignity—held, it would seem, to have fallen into abeyance through the King's imprisonment—was solemnly renewed, and Hugh the Great once more became the faithful liegeman and homager of the King whom he had just before held in bonds.¹ The other princes of the Kingdom followed his example; but, if the Norman writers are to be believed, there was one marked exception. On the banks of the Epte, where the founder of the Norman state had first done homage, the Duke of the Normans was formally set free from all superiority on the part of the King of the French.² Richard still bore no higher title than that of Duke, but he was a King, as far as complete authority within his own land, and absolute independence of all authority beyond its borders, could make him a King.³ The Prince who was thus acknowledged as perfectly independent was presently persuaded, like other allodial proprietors, to seek a Lord,⁴ and Richard, Duke of the Normans, forthwith commended himself and his dominions to his neighbour and benefactor Hugh, Duke of the French.⁵ Now the absolute independence of Nor-

CHAP. IV.

Hugh and the other Princes do homage. 946.

The absolute independence of Normandy asserted by the Norman writers.

Richard's Commendation to Hugh.

¹ Flod. A. 946. "Qui Dux Hugo renovans Regi Ludowico regium honorem vel nomen, ei sese cum cæteris regni committit primoribus." Richer cuts the matter shorter (ii. 51). "Unde et dimissus, datâ Lauduno, Compendii sese recepit."

² Dudo, 126 C. "Venit Rex supra fluvium Eptæ contra Northmannos, cum Magno Duce Hugone. . . . Propriis verbis fecit securitatem *regni* quod suus avus Rollo vi ac potestate, armis et præliis sibi acquisivit. Ipseque et omnes episcopi, comites, et abbates reverendi, principesque Franciæ regni Richardo puero innocenti, ut teneat et possideat, et *nullis nisi Deo servitium ipse et successio ejus reddat*, et si quis perversæ invasionis rixatione contra eum congregi, vel alicujus rixationis congressione invadere *regnum*, maluerit, fidissimus adjutor in omni adversæ inopportunitatis necessitate per omnia extituit."

³ See above, p. 193. For *regnum* as applied to Normandy by Dudo, see the last passage and many others.

⁴ See above, p. 129.

⁵ Dudo, 128 D et seqq., gives a long account of the deliberations be-

CHAP. IV. mandy, the renunciation of all homage and all superiority on the part of the Crown,¹ is an assertion for which we

tween Hugh and Bernard of Senlis. It seems at last to be settled that Richard, like Jacob in the Old Testament, is to become Hugh's man (though the relation is delicately expressed), in exchange for Hugh's daughter, a possession on which, as it happened, Richard seems to have set no great store. But the doctrine of *Commendation*, as set forth by Hugh or by Dudo, is worth notice.

"Hugo vero Magnus intelligens animadvertisse utrumque affectum voluntatis suæ, apertâ cordis sui intentione dicitur respondisse: 'Non est quippe mos Franciæ, ut qualibet Princeps Duxve constipatus abundantius tanto milite perseveret cunctis diebus taliter in dominio ditionis suæ, ut non aut famulatu voluntatis suæ, aut coactus vi et potestate, incumbat acclivius Imperatori, vel Regi, Ducive: et si forte perseveraverit in temeritate audaciæ suæ, ut non famulareter alicui volenter præcopiosâ ubertate sufficientiæ suæ; solent ei rixæ dissentionesque atque casus innumerabilis detrimenti sæpissime accidere. Quapropter si placuisset Richardo Duci tuo nepoti seipsum flecteret ut militaret mihi, vestro saluberrimo consilio sponte filiam meam connubio illi jungerem; et terræ, quam hereditario jure possidet, continuus defensor et adjutor contra omnes adessem.'"

¹ This seems to be implied in the words of Dudo. I must however quote the words of Sir Francis Palgrave (ii. 494-5. Cf. Hen. Hunt. M. H. B. 762 E.)

"A perfect reciprocity was established between France and the 'Norman Monarchy.' . . . That dominion which Rollo the Grandsire had won by so many battles, Richard shall henceforward have and hold, owing service to none but God.—Should any enemy attempt to disturb the right of the Norman Sovereign, the King of France shall be his help and aid in all things.—No other service shall Normandy render unless the King should grant the Duke some Benefice within the Kingdom of France. Therefore, as it was explained in after-time, the Duke of Normandy doth no more than promise faith and homage to the King of France. In like manner doth the King of France render the same fealty to the Duke of Normandy; nor is there any other difference between them, save that the King of France doth not render homage to the Duke of Normandy like as the Duke of Normandy doth to the King."

If I rightly understand Sir Francis Palgrave, his meaning is that the Duke of the Normans now ceased to be the liegeman of the *King* of the French; that he merely entered into a treaty on equal terms with his ex-suzerain; that by voluntary commendation he became the liegeman of the *Duke* of the French; that the subsequent vassalage of Normandy to France was due, not to the Kingdom, but to the Duchy, and that it had its origin in the homage paid by Richard the Fearless to Duke Hugh, not in that paid by Rolf to King Charles. I say, if I rightly understand Sir Francis, because I cannot quite reconcile his statements with one another. In one page there "is perfect reciprocity established between France and

need some better authority than the declamation of Dudo. CHAP. IV.
In his pages indeed Richard appears as a King, holding the Norman monarchy in fee of no earthly power. But he also appears as one who far more than forestalled the successes of his descendants, who held all Gaul and all Britain, with seemingly Germany and Denmark to boot, as dependencies of his Norman monarchy.¹ By the accuracy of the one description we may perhaps judge of the accuracy of the other.

But the Commendation of Normandy to the Duchy of France rests on much better authority. Dudo brings it out far less strongly than he does the independence of Normandy on the Kingdom, but it is incomparably the better ascertained fact of the two. In the days of Richard, we get our first glimpses of documentary evidence for Norman history in the form of charters, and in an extant

the Norman monarchy." Richard has and holds his dominion, owing service to none but God,—yet directly afterwards it is allowed that "the Duke of Normandy promises fealty and homage to the King of France." It is dangerous to dispute with Sir Francis Palgrave on a question of feudal law, and the more so, as the relations between Normandy and France at once awaken the whole controversy about "liege" and "simple" homage. But surely, even in a case of simple homage, there is not "perfect reciprocity" between him who pays and him who receives the homage; and certainly, in the tale as I read it, I see nothing but the simple relation of suzerain and vassal, only clouded over by the big words of Dudo. And as for reciprocity, surely reciprocity of a certain kind was the essence of the feudal relation. Lord and vassal were each to help and defend the other. No one denies that Henry the Second was the vassal of King Lewis the Seventh, if not for Normandy, at any rate for his other continental possessions, but an equal obligation is imposed, in their mutual oath, on Lewis to defend Henry "sicut fidelem suum," as on Henry to defend Lewis "Dominum suum." (R. Wendover, ii. 388.)

¹ Dudo, 138 A. "Burgundionibus imperat, Aquitanos arguit, et increpat Britones, et Northmannos regnat et gubernat, Flandrenses minatur, et devastat Dacos et Lotharienses, quinetiam Saxones sibi connectit et conciliat. Angli quoque ei obedienter subduntur, Scoti et Hibernenses ejus patrocínio reguntur." Cf. p. 209.

Pity that Dudo had never heard of such titles as "brother of the sun and moon" or "lord of the twenty-four umbrellas." They might well have been added to his list.

CHAP. IV. charter, Richard distinctly speaks of the Duke of the French as his Lord.¹ And it is clear that homage to the Duke carried with it a much more practical relation than homage to the King. Throughout this whole period we find Normandy constantly acting as a subsidiary ally of Ducal France. Hugh is followed in his campaigns by Norman troops, seemingly as a matter of course.²

Double alliance, between Normandy and Ducal France and between Germany and Royal France.

A double alliance was thus formed, between Normandy and Ducal France on the one hand, between Germany and Royal France on the other. And the alliance of Normandy and Ducal France sealed the fate of the Carolingian monarchy. That monarchy lasted forty years longer, but its doom was pronounced when Richard commended himself to Hugh. It did not fall when its fortunes seemed lowest. At that moment it had still a powerful protector without, and its utter extinction did not suit the peculiar policy of the powerful vassal, who, as far as internal politics were concerned, held its destiny in his hands. But even the German protectorate could hardly have much longer sustained the German throne of Laôn against the growing power of the new French nationality. When that protectorate was forfeited, there was no longer any hope for it.

The alliance between Normandy and Ducal France determines the fall of the Carolingian dynasty. 945-987.

Again, had Normandy remained isolated and Teutonic, things might have taken a different course. Had Rouen been hostile, or even doubtful, Paris might not have triumphed over Laôn. Charles the Simple had been able to raise up a powerful Norman diversion against the rival King, which staved off his fate for a while. So, had Richard been other than Hugh Capet's faithful vassal and

¹ "Cum assensu *Senioris mei* Hugonis, Francorum principis." I quote from Lappenberg, *Norman Kings*, p. 30. The date is 968, the Lord therefore Hugh Capet.

² Flod. 948. "Hugo, nullam moram faciens, collecta suorum multâ Nortmannorumque manu." 949. "Hugo Comes collecta suorum multâ Nortmannorumque manu." "Hugo igitur non modico tam suorum quam Nortmannorum collecto exercitu."

affectionate brother, a similar Norman diversion might, for a while at least, have preserved the Crown to the House of Charles. But Normandy was now the firm ally of Ducal France, and against the two Royal France had no chance of holding its own. The definitive alliance of Rouen and Paris fixed the extinction, slow, it might be, but sure, of the royalty of Laón. It was a question of time. All depended on the policy of the successive Dukes of the French. And we shall presently have to observe the policy of Hugh Capet, widely different from that of his father, but quite as remarkable in its own way.

This double alliance was not slow in bearing fruit. The threats of Otto, unlike the threats of Eadmund, were carried into action. Lewis had indeed been set free, but he was set free on terms which his royal colleague and brother must have felt to be dishonouring to himself as well as to his ally. A war shortly followed, in which the two Kings appear as the common enemies of the two Dukes. But it is a war about which it is very difficult to get at the exact truth. In the part which relates to Normandy, the French writers are, evidently of set purpose, meagre beyond expression. Our chief German authority, though he enlarges on one or two trifling points,¹ is, on the point which most immediately concerns us, hardly fuller than his Western fellows. The Norman legend, on the other hand, overwhelms us with details, half of which we instinctively suspect to be mythical. There is no doubt that the issue of the campaign was, in a military point of view, inglorious, to say the least, for the two Kings of the Franks. This was quite reason enough for the French and German writers to slur over the subject, and for the Normans to pick it out as a sub-

War of the
two Kings
against the
two Dukes.
946.

Comparison of the
French,
German,
and Norman
accounts.

¹ Widukind (ii. 2) has a good deal to tell us about the threats exchanged between Hugh and Otto, and about the straw hats worn by Otto's soldiers, but he cuts the details of the campaign very short. See Palgrave, ii. 544.

CHAP. IV.
Objects of
Lewis and
Otto; sup-
posed in-
trigues of
Arnulf.

ject for special rhetoric and exaggeration. In their story Arnulf, as usual, appears as the villain of the piece. He stirs up the whole strife; his scheme is for Lewis to cede to Otto all claims on Lotharingia, and to receive instead Normandy, to be conquered for him by the arms of the German King.¹ But the French and German writers know nothing of these machinations of Arnulf, and in their eyes, or at least in their writings, Normandy never assumes any such primary importance. The interference of Otto, in connexion with what went before and what followed, is intelligible enough, and it hardly needs the introduction of Arnulf to explain it. Yet it is likely enough that the scheme said to have been suggested by the wily Fleming really did form an element in the calculations of the two Kings. It was most important to settle the ever-recurring Lotharingian question, which had formed a subject of discord between them even in the very year of Lewis' occupation of Rouen.² And, after Lewis' defeat and imprisonment, we may be sure that the conquest or humiliation of Normandy was an object very dear to his heart.

944.
Probable
designs of
Lewis on
Normandy.

Otto enters
West-
France;
meeting of
the three
Kings,
Otto,
Lewis, and
Conrad.

At all events, with whatever objects, the King of the East-Franks³ entered the Western Kingdom, and was joyfully welcomed by its King, who joined him with all his forces. A third King joined the muster, Conrad of Burgundy,⁴ who followed in the wake of Otto. Of the

¹ Dudo, 129 D.

² This Lotharingian dispute is not mentioned by Richer, but it appears in Flodoard, A. 944. Lewis and Hugh both sent embassies to Otto, and that of Hugh met with the more favourable reception. Things changed greatly in the course of a year.

³ The Germans are still "Orientales" in Dudo, 130 B. So their King is "Rex Transrhenanus." Dudo, 129 B, makes Henry still King, and presently—finding out his mistake, but not correcting it—he goes on to talk of Otto. This year, 946, Otto lost his beloved English wife Eadgyth. Flod. A. 946. Widukind, ii. 41. iii. 1.

⁴ Sir Francis Palgrave (ii. 543) says, "Among other vassals or dependents, Otho was joined by Conrad 'King of Geneva,' under which style we

OTTO IN FRANCE AND NORMANDY.

four Carolingian Kingdoms three were thus united the upstart powers of Paris and Rouen. And, among the German King, not yet Emperor in formal rank a distinct and recognized Imperial precedence. France and Burgundy do not indeed seem to owe him formal homage, but their sovereigns were far more to his vassals, in any practical sense of the word, than the Dukes against whom they were marching were vassals the King of Compiègne. The three Kings began by an attempt to extend the despoiled monarch's possessions by the recovery of his lost fortress of Laon.¹ This attempt failed, but they took Rheims, expelled Hugh, the Duke's Archbishop, and restored Artald, the faithful servant of King Lewis.² They then entered the Duchy of France, they ravaged the whole country, they but shrank from or failed in an attack on Paris.³ They then ravaged

might have some difficulty in recognizing the King of Burgundy, yet the title is not undeserving of notice, as embodying the very few remaining recollections of a kingdom practically effaced from historical memory."

This I do not understand. As Sir Francis gives no references, I cannot undertake to deny that Conrad may be called "King of Geneva" somewhere, but he certainly is not so called in any of the most obvious authorities for this campaign. Widukind does not mention him at all. In Flodoard (A. 946) he is, as usual, "Cisalpine Gallie Rex." In Richer (ii. 53) he is "Rex Genaunorum." (Did Sir Francis read "Genevanorum"? It is strange geography of Richer's to place the Genauni in Burgundy but we find again in ii. 98, "Urbem Vesontium quae est metropolis Genaunorum, cui etiam in Alpibus sita Aldis Dubis praeterfluit" ecclesiastical Province of Besançon answers almost exactly to Transjurane Burgundy. In iii. 86 Conrad is, still more wonderfully, made into "Alemannorum." Richer, in short, despised the geography of his own and used his obsolete names without much discretion.

Richer, it may be noticed, makes Conrad the independent ally of while in Flodoard he simply follows Otto.

¹ Wid. iii. 3. "Lugdunum [Laudunum] adiit, eamque armis tenuit." Flodoard (946) says, "Considerata castri firmitate devertunt ab eo." Richer, ii. 54.

² Flod. u. s. Wid. u. s. Richer, ii. 54-6. Widukind places Conrad before the invasion of Ducal France.

³ The accounts here vary a good deal. Widukind says, "Ipsa [this name is used, I know not why, by many mediæval writers]"

CHAP. IV. the Duchy of Normandy, but they failed in an attempt but fail to take either Paris or Rouen. on Rouen.¹ Thus much is certain; the confederate Kings were repulsed from the Norman capital. The picturesque, but probably to a great extent legendary, details form a brilliant picture, for which I must refer to the Norman writers and their English interpreter.²

Effects of the German intervention.

Lewis' fortunes begin to improve. 947.

That the discomfiture of three Kings, the repulse of the Great Otto himself, should have been a favourite subject of Norman boasting was no more than was natural; but it is by no means clear that the German intervention was altogether fruitless. We have seen the fortunes of Lewis at their lowest ebb. We now see them very distinctly begin to rise, while those of Hugh the Great suffer a temporary depression. The Duke failed in several expeditions,³ while the King went on gaining both in territorial dominion and in the opinion of men.

incluable noun] perrexit, Hugonemque ibi obsedit, memoriam quoque Dionysii martyris [Hugh was Lay Abbot of his Minster] dignè honorans veneratus est." Flodoard says, "Reges cum exercitibus suis terram Hugonis aggrediuntur, et urbem Silvanectensem obsidentes, ut viderunt munitissimam, nec eam valentes expugnare, cæsis quibusdam suorum, dimiserunt. Sicque trans Sequanam contententes, loca quæque præter civitates gravibus atterunt deprædationibus, terramque Nortmannorum peragrantes, loca plura devastant; indeque venientes regrediuntur in sua." Could Widukind have confounded Paris and Senlis? Richer, who has some curious details (ii. 57), mentions the siege of Senlis (56) but says nothing of Paris, and he quarters Hugh at Orleans (58). Dudo (130 B) makes the Kings meet at Paris, so far confirming Widukind. Dudo doubtless did not care about the fate of Laon or Rheims.

¹ Neither Flodoard nor Richer mentions Rouen. All that Richer (ii. 58) has to say of the Norman campaign is, "Post hæc feruntur in terram piratarum ac solo terras devastant. Sicque Regis injuriam atrociter ultæ, iter ad sua retorquent." But Widukind (iii. 4) has, "Exinde, collecta ex omni exercitu electorum militum manu, Rothun Danorum urbem adiit, sed difficultate locorum, asperiorique hieme ingruente, plagâ eos quidem magnâ percussit; incolumi exercitu, infecto negotio, post tres menses Saxoniam regressus est, urbibus Remense atque Lugduno [a clear error] cum cæteris armis captis Hluthowico Regi concessis."

² Dudo, 131-5. Roman de Rou, 3914-4291. Palgrave, ii. 556-586.

³ Against Flanders, (Flod. A. 947; Richer, ii. 60); against Rheims, (Flod. t.s.; Richer, ii. 62); against Soissons, (Flod. 948; Richer, ii. 85).

The close connexion between the two Frankish Kings continued, and both Lewis and his Queen shared the hospitality of their brother, and took a part in the paschal splendours of Aachen.¹ Not the least striking feature of this period is the series of Synods, Synods of Bishops from both the Frankish kingdoms, but to which the Eastern realm naturally contributed by far the greater share. The first of the series, held on the banks of the Cher, was held simultaneously with a secular conference, and with armies at no great distance.² The later meetings, at Verdun,³ at Mouzon,⁴ and the last and most solemn, held at Engelheim⁵ under the presidency of a Papal Legate, seem to have been essentially ecclesiastical assemblies. But the Kings were present, acting as royal colleagues, the Eastern King retaining his distinct superiority.⁶ Otto may well have dreamed of himself as a new Constantine, presiding in a new Nicene Council. The strictly ecclesiastical object of these assemblies was to decide the controversy between

CHAP. IV.
Friendship
of Lewis
and Otto.
947, 949.
Series of
Synods.
Meeting
by the
Cher.
947.
Synods of
Verdun,
(947);
Mouzon,
and Engel-
heim,
(948).
Action of
the Kings.

¹ Lewis in 947, (Flod. in anno ; Richer, ii. 61) ; Gerberga in 949, (Flod. in anno ; Richer, ii. 86). This was a great meeting of German and Lotharingian princes, and of ambassadors from Italy, England, and Constantinople.

² Flod. 947. Richer, ii. 63-5. It would seem that some Bishops were there in their *princely* character, to whom Duke Hugh referred the question about the Archbishopric of Rheims, which the Bishops referred to a more regular Synod to be held at Verdun. Widukind says (iii. 5,) "*Huga autem expertus potentiam Regis virtutemque Saxonum, non passus est ultra terminos suos hostiliter intrare, sed pergenti in eandem expeditionem anno sequenti* [the French writers do not imply this] *occurrit juxta fluvium qui dicitur Char, manus dedit, juxtaque imperium Regis pactum iniit, utilisque proinde permansit.*" This is greatly exaggerated.

³ Flod. 947. Richer, ii. 66.

⁴ Flod. 948. Richer, ii. 67, 8.

⁵ Flod. 948. Richer, ii. 69-81.

⁶ I quote some passages from Flodoard illustrating the position of the Kings. "*Ingressis gloriosis Regibus Othone et Ludowico et simul residentibus . . . exurgens Ludowicus Rex à latere et consessu Domini Regis Othonis.*" Lewis offers "*inde se juxta synodale judicium et Regis Othonis præceptionem purgaret, vel certamine singulari defenderet.*" "*Interea Rex Ludowicus deprecatur Regem Othonem ut subsidium sibi ferat contra Hugonem, et ceteros inimicos suos. Qui petitioni concedens,*" &c.

CHAP. IV. the rival Archbishops who disputed, and alternately occupied, the Metropolitan See of Rheims. But such a point could not be dealt with as a mere matter of Canon Law. The real question was, not whether Hugh or Artald was the more regularly elected Primate, but whether the great city of Rheims should be held by a Prince devoted to the Duke or by a Prince devoted to the King. The affairs of the Western Kingdom were fully discussed in an assembly of Prelates, most of whom were subjects of the Eastern King. Lewis set forth the whole story of his wrongs before his brother King and the Bishops, and prayed both of them to use their several arms, temporal and spiritual, against his enemy. The result was, not only that Rheims was restored to the royalist Archbishop, but that, after due notice, the Duke of the French was solemnly excommunicated in a final Synod at Trier,¹ which, oddly enough, consisted mainly of French Bishops. Hugh however cared little for the excommunication; the war continued, and various places were attacked with varying success on both sides. The Normans appeared as the allies of Hugh;² Otto, engaged in distant affairs, entrusted the support of Lewis to Conrad of Lotharingia.³ By a stratagem of Rudolf, the father of the historian, Laôn was recovered to the King, except the Tower, which still held out for Hugh.⁴ At last an excommunication pronounced by Pope Agapetus in person⁵ seems to have made some impression on the stubborn mind of the Duke. Through the mediation of Otto, peace was made once more; Hugh

Controversy about the See of Rheims; its political importance.

Final Synod of Trier; Hugh the Great excommunicated. 948.

Laôn recovered by Lewis. 949.

Hugh excommunicated by Pope Agapetus. 949.

¹ Flod. 948. The Synod adjourned from Engelheim to Laôn and from Laôn to Trier, where the anathema against Hugh was pronounced. Flo-doard was himself present, being Chaplain to Archbishop Artald. Richer (ii. 82) confounds the two adjournments, and makes the anathema be pronounced at Laôn.

² See above, p. 250.

³ See above, p. 235.

⁴ Flod. A. 949. Richer, at great length, ii. 87-91.

⁵ Flod. A. 949. Richer, ii. 95.

again did homage in the fullest terms,¹ and restored to the King the Tower of Laôn, which he still held. After this, though smaller wars and bickerings still went on in Lotharingia, Vermandois, and elsewhere, there was for four years actually only one revolt of Hugh, and that one after which the Great Duke found it expedient to beg for peace through the intercession of Queen Gerberga.² During all this time the power of Lewis was steadily growing. Whether by force or persuasion, he gained over to his side the Princes of Aquitaine, who no doubt welcomed the King as a convenient rival to their nearer neighbour the Duke.³ Lewis even passed the boundaries of his own Kingdom; he visited Besançon, and received the homage of at least one prince of the Royal Burgundy, Charles Constantine of Vienne.⁴ All things seemed prospering for the Carolingian King, when his strange and unexpected death cut short the hopes of his house.⁵ After all his long and chequered career, he was only thirty-three years of age.

CHAP. IV.
Hugh does
homage
again.
950.

His last re-
volt and
submis-
sion.
953.

Lewis'
progress
in Aqu-
taine and
in Bur-
gundy.
951.

His death.
954.

The long reign of Lothar, the son and successor of Lewis, forms only a portion of the much longer reign of Richard the Fearless. In the course of a few years most of the French principalities changed masters. Long before the reign of Lothar was over, almost before he had

Reign of
Lothar.
954-986.
The old
generation
of princes
dies off.

¹ Flod. A. 950. "Hugo ad Regem venit et suus efficitur." Richer, ii. 97. "Dux . . . Regi humiliter reconciliari deprecatur, eique satisfactorum sese pollicetur. . . . Hugo itaque dux per manus et sacramentum Regi efficitur."

² Flod. A. 953.

³ Richer's narrative (ii. 98) differs from that of Flodoard in introducing Hugh as gathering the army for the Aquitanian expedition, of which the King afterwards takes the command. But Richer's French translator seems to misconceive his meaning when he renders "*in Aquitaniam exercitum Regi parat*" by "*le duc leva une armée en Aquitaine.*"

⁴ Flod. A. 951. Richer, u. s., who says that Charles "*ex regio quidem genere natus erat, sed concubinali stemmate usque ad tritavum sordebat.*" Neither of them gives him the royal title which he certainly bore.

⁵ Flod. A. 954. Richer, ii. 103.

CHAP. IV. personally entered on his government, Richard, so lately a child, the youngest of princes, became the senior ruler within his own world. King Lewis was dead already; Hugh the Great died two years later; old Arnulf of Flanders, at an almost incredible old age, died nine years later still.¹ Otto, King and Emperor, survived all these princes, but Richard survived both him and his son. Richard succeeded to his Duchy in the time of Eadmund of England; he survived Eadmund, Eadred, Eadwig, and Eadgar, and lived far on into the reign of Æthelred. In France he beheld, and aided in, the extinction of the Carolingian dynasty, and he died in the same year as the first King of the permanent Parisian succession. But this long period is, if we contrast it with that which went before it, comparatively barren of events bearing on the history of the Norman Duchy. Richard wrought great changes within his own dominions, and he had many enemies to contend against without; still the greater part of his reign was no longer one incessant struggle, like the reign of his father and his own early days. For some years, wars and disputes went on almost as vigorously as before, but, for many years before his death, Richard seems to have enjoyed a period of comparative peace, which he devoted to the consolidation of his power within his own states, and, in a great degree, to the erection and enrichment of ecclesiastical foundations.

Hugh the Great.
956.

Arnulf
born
873,
died 965.

Otto the Great.
973.

Otto the Second.
983.

996.

954-962.
Comparative quiet
of the later
years of
Richard.
962-996.

Young Lothar was chosen King without opposition; Hugh and Archbishop Bruno, now his brother's representative in Lotharingia, both espoused his cause.² But Hugh soon contrived to employ the boy whom he recog-

¹ Flod. A. 965. Richer, iii. 21.

² Flod. A. 954. "Lotharius puer, filius Ludowici, apud Sanctum Remigium Rex consecratur ab Artaldo Archiepiscopo, favente Hugone Principe et Brunone Archiepiscopo, cæterisque præsulibus ac proceribus Franciæ, Burgundiæ, atque Aquitanie." Richer (iii. 1, 2) is fuller, but to the same effect.

nized as his sovereign as the tool of his own crafty policy. CHAP. IV.
 As has been already said, the Princes of Southern Gaul were the natural allies of the King against the Duke, who was so dangerous a neighbour to both. The most powerful, at the least the most prominent, among them, William of Poitiers, the brother-in-law of William of Normandy,¹ seems to have been on the whole a faithful vassal of Lewis,² and he had certainly given no recent cause of offence. But Hugh procured from Lothar a grant of the Duchy of Aquitaine, in addition to those of France and Burgundy,³ and it was probably in order to enforce this claim that he involved the King in a war with the Aquitanian Princes. But Hugh was utterly baffled before Poitiers,⁴ and, soon after this defeat, his busy and faithless life, hitherto in general so successful, came to an end.⁵ The Duchy of France, like the Kingdom and the Duchy of Normandy, now passed to a minor. Hugh, surnamed Capet, the future King, succeeded his father at the age of thirteen years, and, on account of his youth, he is said to have been left, by his father's will, under the guardianship of the Duke of the Normans.⁶ Besides the close political connexion between the two princes, Richard was betrothed to Emma, daughter of the elder and sister of the younger Hugh, whom, some years later, he married.⁷

Hugh
 embroils
 Lothar
 with the
 Aquitanian
 princes,
 but is
 defeated
 before
 Poitiers.
 955.

 Death of
 Hugh the
 Great.

 Hugh
 Capet suc-
 ceeds
 under the
 guardian-
 ship of
 Richard.
 956.
 Richard
 marries
 Hugh's
 sister
 Emma.
 960.

¹ He married Gerloc or Adela, daughter of Rolf and Popa. Dudo (97 B, C) has a curious story about his courtship.

² See Flod. A. 942, 951. Richer, ii. 28, 98.

³ Flod. A. 954. "Burgundia quoque et Aquitania Hugoni dantur ab ipso [Lothario]."

⁴ Flod. A. 955. Richer, iii. 3-5, who puts as good a face as he can on Hugh's discomfiture, and makes more of a subsequent victory over William, and of a second more successful siege, of which Flodoard says nothing.

⁵ Flod. A. 956. "Hugo Princeps obiit." Richer, iii. 5.

⁶ Dudo, 136 D.

⁷ Flod. A. 960. "Richardus, filius Willelmi Nortmannorum Principis, filiam Hugonis trans Sequanam [or 'Transsequani'] quondam Principis [an odd description], duxit uxorem." Dudo (136, 7) and Sir Francis Palgrave (ii. 690-4) have much to say about this marriage.

CHAP. IV. ever did homage to Lothar is not clear,¹ but Hugh, on his accession to manhood, did homage to the King, and was invested with the Duchies of France and Poitou, Burgundy being assigned to his younger brother Otto.² The death of Otto however, before many years had passed, caused Burgundy also to revert to Hugh.³ Richard also renewed the Commendation which he had made to the elder Hugh, and became the loyal vassal of his brother-in-law.⁴ Arnulf, the old enemy, was now growing old;⁵ so the functions of devil or villain are now transferred in the Norman tale to Theobald, Count of Tours, Chartres, and Blois. This prince, who, like Arnulf, reached an unusual age, was the son of an elder Theobald, who is said to have purchased the County of Chartres of the famous Sea-King Hasting.⁶ The second Theobald had married Liutgarda, the widow of William Longsword and step-mother of Richard; he was a vassal of the Duke of the French,⁷ and, in that character, he had acted for Hugh

The sons of Hugh do homage to Lothar, and Richard does homage to Hugh.
960.

Enmity of Theobald of Tours towards Richard.

¹ I suspect that no such homage ever was rendered. The French writers do not mention it, though they would doubtless have been glad to mention it if it had happened. And Flodoard's way of speaking of Richard is remarkable. William was "the Prince of the Normans;" Richard is only "the son of William Prince of the Normans." But I have no doubt that the homage was lawfully due, and it was most likely its refusal which led to the differences between Lothar and Richard.

² Flod. A. 960. "Otto et Hugo filii Hugonis, mediante avunculo ipsorum Brunone, ad Regem veniunt ac sui efficiuntur. Quorum Hugonem Rex Ducem constituit, addito illi pago Pictavensi ad terram quam pater ipsius tenuerat; concessa Ottoni Burgundia." So Richer, iii. 13.

³ Flod. A. 965. "Otto filius Hugonis, qui Burgundiæ præerat, obiit, et rectores ejusdem terræ ad Hugonem et Oddonem clericum, fratres ipsius, sese convertunt." According to *L'Art de vérifier les Dates* (ii. 495, ed. 1784), "Oddo clericus" is the same as Henry the Great, founder of the first line of Capetian Dukes of Burgundy.

⁴ This is implied in the Charter quoted in p. 250, n. 1.

⁵ In 958 Arnulf either associated his son Baldwin with him in his government, or else resigned in his favour. On his death in 962 he again took possession. See *L'Art de vérifier les Dates*, iii. 3.

⁶ See *L'Art de vérifier les Dates*, ii. 611.

⁷ Flod. A. 962. "Seniorem suum [Tetbaldi] Hugonem."

the Great as the gaoler of King Lewis.¹ But he seems to have by no means adopted his suzerain's policy towards the Normans; on the contrary he appears as the instigator of Gerberga and Lothar to every sort of hostility against Richard.² The French accounts, which commonly speak of Theobald with a certain tone of contempt,³ tell us just enough to show that there is some ground of truth in all this. Theobald's chief object seems to have been the acquisition of Evreux, which, at one time, he actually gained by the help of Lothar.⁴ Before this, if we may trust the Norman tale, Theobald and the King had formed with Bruno, Archbishop and Duke, a treacherous plot to beguile Richard to a conference at Amiens, and there to put him to death or imprison him.⁵ I confess that this sounds to me very like a Norman perversion of a much better authenticated fact. King Lothar had summoned to Soissons a General Assembly of the chief men of his realm, an event so common in England and so rare in France. Whether the Duke of the Normans was summoned or not does not appear; but he came with an armed force and attempted to disperse the Assembly, but was beaten off by the King's troops.⁶ In the next year we find Theobald at war with Richard and defeated by him. Being also on ill terms with his own Lord, Duke Hugh, he took shelter with Gerberga and Lothar, and was kindly received by them.⁷

Theobald
gains
Evreux.

962.

Supposed
plot of
Lothar,
Bruno,
and Theo-
bald
against
Richard.
960.

Richard
attempts
to disperse
the As-
sembly at
Soissons.
961.

Theobald
defeated
by Richard.
962.

¹ Flod. A. 945. "Committens [Hugo] eum [Ludowicum] Tetbaldo cuidam suorum." He had just before called him "Tetbaldus Turonensis."

² Dudo, 137 D et seqq.

³ Flod. A. 962. "Tetbaldus quidam." 964. "Tetbaldum quemdam procerem."

⁴ Dudo, 142 C.

⁵ Ib. 139 C et seqq.

⁶ Flod. A. 961. "Placitum regale diversorumque conventus principum Suesionis habetur, ad quod impediendum, si fieri posset, Richardus filius Willelmi Nortmanni accedens, a fidelibus Regis quibusdam pervasus, et, interemptis suorum nonnullis, in fugam versus est."

⁷ Flod. A. 962. "Tetbaldus quidam cum Nortmannis configens victus est ab eis, et fugâ dilapsus evasit. Qui seniore[m] suum Hugonem proinde infensum habens ad Regem venit, à quo, sed et à Regina Gerbergâ benignè

CHAP. IV. In the Norman version this grows into a long and striking story.¹ Just as in the tale of Lewis and Harold Bluetooth, a conference between Lothar and Richard develops into a battle in which Lothar, like his father, is, of course, utterly defeated. Yet, even while thus victorious, Richard is neither satisfied nor confident. He sends again to King Harold in Denmark; Harold at once comes at his call, but has no opportunity of renewing his old exploits. For the French are thoroughly afraid of him. Count Theobald at once makes peace, and restores Evreux. King Lothar begs for peace also, and craves that the terrible Danes may be sent away. But it is not so easy to send them away as to bring them in. However Duke Richard does his best; he goes in person, and preaches an eloquent sermon to the pagans, exhorting them to embrace Christianity and to settle quietly in the country. This a portion of them are induced to do, while the stiff-necked heathens are persuaded to sail southwards to ravage Infidel Spain instead of Catholic Gaul. After this, a peace is made between Lothar and Richard,² which seems not to have been again broken.

Norman version ;
defeat of
Lothar ;
second in-
tervention
of Harold.

Peace be-
tween Lo-
thar and
Richard.

Compari-
son of the
French and
Norman
accounts.

It is impossible to say exactly how much of truth lurks in all this. The French writers help us to little more than the fact that there was some amount of hostility between Lothar and Richard. Richard tries to disperse Lothar's solemn Parliament; Lothar kindly entertains Richard's vanquished enemy. Where there was as much mutual ill-will as this, it is likely that there was much more. And, while we must always allow for the inventions and ex-

susceptus, et miti consolatione refocillatus abscessit." Richer only mentions Theobald in connexion with his spoliation of the Church of Rheims and his consequent excommunication. iii. 20. So Flod. A. 964.

¹ Dudo, 140 C et seqq.

² The "Norman Kingdom" was, according to Dudo (147 C, D. 151 C), confirmed by the King and his Princes ("Optimates totius Franciæ") to Richard and his heirs for ever; the question of homage is avoided.

RELATIONS BETWEEN RICHARD AND LOTAR

aggravations of the Norman writers, we must allow for the evident unwillingness of the French writers to say one word more about the Normans than they could. But the whole Norman story is strange and improbable and many of the events sound most temptingly like petitions of earlier events. We seem to be reading the life of Lewis and Harold over again with but slight variations. Yet the dates come within the life, perhaps within the memory, of our one original informant on the Norman side.¹ I leave the more minute examination and final decision of the matter to those with whom Norman history is a primary object. It is enough for my purpose that the few distinctly authenticated facts fall in with the more elaborate picture in the legend, so far as to bring out the same general view of Richard's position as the firm ally of Ducal France and as the enemy of the Kingdom.

During the latter part of the reign of Lothar things took a different turn. Hugh Capet now began personally to take the lead in affairs, and his peculiar policy impressed itself on the period. We have already seen what the policy of the elder Hugh was; he would reduce the King of the French to the least possible amount of power and of territory, but he would himself never be more than Duke of the French. . . . Hugh Capet followed a different policy. He was ready to be a King as soon as he could come one quietly and with a decent pretext, but he would not hazard the prize by clutching at it too soon. relations between King and Duke during the last two years of Lothar were very different from the relations which had existed between the father of Lothar and father of Hugh. There was very little of open enmity

¹ Twenty-four years later, in 986, Dudo, then Canon of St. Omer, was of an age to take a prominent share in public business. Dudo,

CHAP. IV. when there was any, the wily Duke contrived that it should be the King who was outwardly in the wrong. For a long time Duke Hugh acted as the vassal and friend of King Lothar, and the friendship of Duke Hugh of course carried with it the friendship of Duke Richard. On the whole this was a time of peace, a thing hitherto so unusual, between Ducal and Royal France, so much so that the Duchy actually underwent a German invasion in the cause of the King. For it was now that the relations between the two Kingdoms of the Franks again became of paramount importance. It was now that the folly of Lothar forfeited the German protectorate for himself and his Kingdom.

Change in the relations between the two Frankish Kingdoms on the death of Otto the Great. 973. War between Otto and Lothar. Lothar's raid on Aachen and Otto's invasion of France. 978.

It was on the death of Otto the Great that the relations between the Eastern and the Western Kingdoms were completely changed.¹ Otto the uncle had been a protector; Otto the cousin was a rival; the endless disputes about Lotharingia began again;² war broke out, a war which, on Lothar's side, had the approval of the Duke and the other princes,³ but which readily suggests the suspicion that the approval was given as a snare. At any rate Lothar went on a wild and sudden raid against Aachen, which could produce no permanent gain, but which gave him the opportunity of occupying the city of his great ancestor, and of turning the eagle on his palace the wrong way.⁴ But the insulted Emperor retaliated by a far more

¹ See the detailed narrative in Richer, iii. 67-81.

² Did the very name of the country, "regnum Lotharii," suggest to the present Lothar the thought of recovering it? Such a motive would not be out of character with a prince whose indignation was stirred up simply because the Emperor was staying—with his pregnant wife—so near the border as Aachen. So at least Richer tells us, iii. 68.

³ Richer, iii. 69. "Mox Dux et aliis primates, sine deliberandi consultatione, sententiam regiam attollunt. Sese sponte ituros cum Rege et Ottonem aut comprehensuros aut interfecturos aut fugaturos pollicentur."

⁴ Rich. iii. 71. "Æream aquilam quæ in vertice palatii a Karolo magno acsi volans fixa erat, in Vulturum converterunt. Nam Germani eam

terrible invasion of the Western Kingdom, in which, not only the royal domains, but those of the Duke were occupied and ravaged, and Paris itself was threatened.¹ This campaign of Otto the Second, like that of his greater father, was not exactly rich in military glory, but it was politically successful. Lothar, without consulting Hugh, sought for peace,² and gave up his claims on Lotharingia.³ Hugh, who had hitherto stuck so faithfully by the King, was alarmed at his sudden and secret reconciliation with the Emperor. He held a council of his own vassals, and, by their advice, he determined to win over Otto to himself, which he succeeded in doing, though greatly against the will of the King.⁴ Hugh and Lothar were however at last reconciled again.⁵ Lewis the son of Lothar was, with the consent of Hugh and the other princes, associated in the Kingdom with his father.⁶ A ludicrous and unsuccessful attempt was then made to establish him at once as King in Aquitaine by marrying him to a princess of that country.⁷ The notion was in itself a return to a rational

CHAP. IV.

Peace between Otto and Lothar. 980.

Alliance between Otto and Hugh; reconciliation of Lothar and Hugh.

Lewis son of Lothar elected King; his marriage and divorce. 981.

in Favonium converterant, subtiliter significantes Gallos suo. equitatu quandoque posse devinci."

It is amusing to find the characteristic vanity of the Great Nation showing itself thus early. Most likely neither Charles nor any later German had ever thought of anything of the kind.

¹ Richer, iii. 74-76.

² According to Thietmar of Merseburg (iii. 7) Lothar came in person, accompanied by his son. Richer (iii. 79) makes him send ambassadors. The speech put into their mouths seems quite to look on Otto and Lothar as royal colleagues. Otto's Imperial dignity is not hinted at; I doubt whether Richer ever uses the word Emperor at all.

³ Richer, iii. 81. "Belgiæ pars quæ in lite fuerat in jus Ottonis transiit."

⁴ See the narrative, a most full, curious, and interesting one, of Hugh's journey to the Emperor at Rome, and the snares laid for him on his return by Lothar. Richer, iii. 81-88.

⁵ Richer, iii. 89, 90.

⁶ Ib. iii. 91. "A Duce reliquisque principibus Ludovicus Rex acclamatus." Others place this event in 978 or 979.

⁷ Ib. iii. 92-95. Adelaide, widow of Raymond of Septimania or Gothia. Lewis divorced her. Cf. Rod. Glaber, i. 3.

CHAP. IV. policy with regard to Southern Gaul, if it had only been set about in a wiser way. On the death of Otto the Second, Lothar, notwithstanding his former cession of his rights over Lotharingia, took advantage of the minority of Otto the Third, and the consequent anarchy in Germany, again to assert his claims. He was pressing them with some success by force of arms, when his career was cut short by an early death.¹

Death of Otto the Second. 983.
Lothar's further attempts on Lotharingia. 986.

During all this time the narrative of our French authority tells us absolutely nothing about Normandy. Yet we may well believe that Richard took the first place in the assembly of Hugh's vassals, and that Norman troops duly accompanied those of Ducal France in every expedition. The policy of Hugh, we may be sure, was always the policy of Richard. The only thing about him which even his garrulous panegyrist has to tell us is that, after the death of the old Arnulf, when his grandson and successor the younger Arnulf refused his homage to the King, Richard stepped in as mediator. Lothar invaded Flanders, but Richard pacified King and Marquess; Arnulf rendered the homage, and his dominions were restored to him.²

Richard's mediation in Flanders. 965.

And now we have at last reached the great Revolution which extinguished the last remnants of Carolingian royalty, which decided the long controversy between the German Frank and the half Celtic, half Roman, Frenchman, which raised Paris to that rank among the cities of Gaul which it has since never lost, which raised the Lords of Paris to that rank which they have lost—it may be, not for ever—within the memory of a generation which still is young. Lothar was succeeded by his son Lewis, already his colleague in the Kingdom, but his reign was

The accession of the Parisian or Capetian dynasty.

Reign of Lewis the Fifth. 986-987.

¹ Richer, iii. 97-110.

² Dudo, 155 C. Cf. Flod. A. 965.

short and troubled. His counsellors were divided, whether he should assert his independence or should put himself under the protection of Duke Hugh.¹ He chose the safer course, and, in the one act of his reign, he had Hugh to his helper. He attacked and besieged Rheims, in a quarrel with the Archbishop Adalbero, whom he charged with having, nine years before, aided the Emperor Otto in his invasion of France.² But an accommodation was hardly brought about between the King and the Primate, when Lewis died.³ The Princes met at Senlis to elect a successor. Our French writers take care not to mention him, but we can hardly doubt that Richard of Normandy, the most faithful and the most powerful vassal of Duke Hugh, was there ready to support the cause of his Lord and brother. The choice lay between the Duke of the French and the last remaining Karling, Charles, uncle of the late King and brother of Lothar. This prince was unlucky and unpopular, and he had given special offence by accepting Lotharingia, or a part of it, as a fief of the Empire.⁴ A speech from the Primate, setting forth the merits of Hugh, and the lawfulness and necessity of elective monarchy,⁵ settled the minds of the waverers, if any waverers there were. Hugh was chosen King and was crowned at Noyon. Thus did an assertion of the right of election which would not have been out of place in an English Witenagemót or even in a Polish Diet, become the foundation of a dynasty which was to become, more than any other in Europe, the representative of strict hereditary succession. Adalbero raised to the throne a race in which, by a fate unparalleled in any other kingly house, the crown was

CHAP. IV.
He besieges Rheims and dies. 987.
Diet of election at Senlis. 987.
The doctrine of elective monarchy set forth by Archbishop Adalbero.
Hugh elected and crowned. 987.
Permanence of his dynasty.

¹ Richer, iv. 1.² Ib. iv. 2, 3.³ Ib. iv. 5.⁴ This is alluded to in the words, "Qui tanta capitis imminutione hebuit [any notion of the legal phrase of '*deminutio capitis*'?] ut externo Regi servire non horruerit." Richer, iv. 11.⁵ See above, p. 119.

CHAP. IV. passed on for three hundred and fifty years from father
 987-1328. to son, a race which, down to our own day, has never
 been without a male heir, and in which the right of the
 male heir has never been disputed, save once through the
 1338-1420. ambition of a foreign prince and once through the frenzy
 1589. of religious partizanship. The crown of England and the
 crown of Spain have been repeatedly, by revolution or by
 female succession, carried away from the direct male heir to
 distant kinsmen or to absolute strangers. But every King
 of the French crowned at Rheims has been at once a
 Frenchman by birth and the undisputed heir of the founder
 of the dynasty. Hugh and his son Robert, neither of
 them born to royalty, were crowned the one at Noyon
 the other at Orleans. Henry the Fourth, the one King
 whose right was disputed, was crowned at Chartres.
 Rheims alone preserved her proud prerogative as the
 crowning place of Kings whose right was never so much
 as called in question. Paris, the seat of temporal domi-
 nion, has never been the ecclesiastical home of the nation,
 the crowning-place of lawful Kings. None but strangers
 and usurpers have ever taken the diadem of France in the
 capital of France. While Rheims has beheld the corona-
 tion of so many generations of native Frenchmen, Paris
 has beheld only the coronation of a single English King
 and a single Corsican Tyrant.

Struggle
 between
 Hugh and
 Charles.
 987-991.

Hugh of Paris was thus chosen King, as his great-uncle
 Odo of Paris had been chosen King before him. But the
 hundred years' rivalry between the two dynasties was not yet
 settled. As Odo had to struggle with Charles the Simple,
 so Hugh had to struggle with his grandson Charles of
 Lotharingia. Hugh's election and coronation did not
 make him the immediate possessor of anything beyond the
 limits of his own Duchy. Laôn, the royal city, would not
 at once consent, either to forsake the line of its ancient
 princes or calmly to sink into a dependency of Paris.

Hugh, after some difficulty, procured the election and coronation of his son Robert as his colleague in the Kingdom,¹ and the two Kings, as they are always called, carried on a war of several years against Charles and his party.² The last Karling has now sunk to the position of a Tyrant—a name which once was the description of Hugh's father when a rebel against the father of Charles. The struggle was at last ended by Charles being betrayed to the Kings by the treachery of Archbishop Adalbero. Charles died in prison, but his children continued to reign in Lotharingia as vassals of the Empire. Lotharingia was thus wholly lost to France; that portion of it which was retained by the female descendants of Charles still preserves its freedom as part of the independent Kingdom of Belgium. But the revolution was now fully accomplished; the struggle of a hundred years was over; the race and the tongue of the Great Charles were finally wiped out from the Kingdom of the Western Franks. Celtic, Romance, Parisian France was now definitively called into being. A Kingdom and nation was founded, in the face of which it has been for so many ages the main work of every other European state to maintain its freedom, its language, and its national being, against the never-ceasing assaults, sometimes of open and high-handed violence, sometimes of plausible falsehood and gilded treachery.

CHAP. IV.

Robert
crowned.

987.

Charles
taken and
imprisoned.
991.Modern
France de-
finitively
begins.

§ 5. *Comparison between France, England, and Normandy.*

The influence which the Norman Duke exercised on this great change is carefully kept out of sight by the French historians; yet we cannot doubt that the Norman writers

Influence
of the Nor-
mans on
the Capet-
ian Revo-
lution.

¹ Richer, iv. 12, 13.

² See the history of the war in Richer, iv. 14-49.

CHAP. IV. are, this time at least, fully justified in attributing to their sovereign a most important share in the transaction.¹

Personal
share of
Richard.

Everything leads us to believe that Richard took a leading personal share in the revolution, and it is quite certain that, but for the policy which Richard followed, that revolution never could have taken place. As I before said,² it was the alliance between Normandy and Ducal France which determined the fate of the Carolingian dynasty. And thus we are led back to the proposition with which I started at an earlier stage of this chapter,³ that it was the settlement of the Scandinavians in Gaul which definitively made Gaul French. They settled just at the point of transition, when the old German state of things was beginning to give way to the new French state of things. The influence of the new comers, notwithstanding their own Teutonic blood and speech, was thrown altogether into the French scale. The Normans became French, because a variety of circumstances brought them more within the range of French influences than of any other. The connexion between

The Nor-
man settle-
ment made
Gaul
French.

¹ Neither Richer—he was not likely—nor Rudolf Glaber speak of Richard at all. Dudo, oddly enough, passes by the whole business very briefly. “Nec illud prætereundum quod, Lothario Rege defuncto [he forgets Lewis], Hugo Dux inthronizatus voluit super Albertum Comitem equitare.” (155 D.) William of Jumièges is fuller. “Mortuo Francorum Rege Lothario, in illius loco ab omnibus subrogatur Hugonis Magni Ducis filius Hugo Capeth, adminiculante ei Duce Richardo.” (iv. 19.) The Roman de Rou (5823) is fuller still—

“Par defaute de son lignage,
O le cunseil del grant Barnage,
E por la force de Richart,
Par son conseil e par son art,
Fu Hugon Chapes recéu,
Et en France pour Rei tenu . . .
Par Richart è par sa valor,
Ki éu aveit sa seror,
Par sun cunseil è par s’amur
Fu de France Huon Seignur.”

² See above, p. 250.

³ See above, p. 172.

Rolf and the Carolingian dynasty was something purely political, or rather personal; he had done homage and sworn oaths to King Charles, and to King Charles he stuck against all pretenders. But the main object of his successors was to bring Normandy within the pale of Christianity and civilization, in such shapes as Christianity and civilization assumed immediately before their eyes. This object they naturally sought by establishing a connexion with their nearest neighbours; their standard of language and manners was set by the French court of Paris, not by the German court of Laôn or by the more distant, the more purely Latin, courts of Poitiers and Toulouse. The Normans thus became Frenchmen, and, with the zeal of new proselytes, they became first and foremost in everything that is characteristically French. The earliest and best productions of the new-born French language were the work of Norman poets. All the ideas which were then growing up in France, ideas which it is hard to express otherwise than by the vague and misleading names of feudalism and chivalry, took firm root in Normandy, and there brought forth their most abundant fruit. Had Normandy remained Danish, the Scandinavian settlement would have been a most important diversion on behalf of the Teutonic element; Romance Paris would have been in a manner hemmed in between two Teutonic lands. And if the Scandinavian settlement had never taken place at all, the French development would at least have lost the decisive support which it gained from the enlistment of such fresh and vigorous disciples. It was the Normans, I repeat, who made Gaul French; it was the Normans who made French Paris the capital of Gaul, and who gave her the French Lord of Paris for her King. On the other hand, it was the Capetian Revolution which gave Normandy her definite position in Gaul and in Europe. Hitherto, in the minds

CHAP. IV.

French
ideas take
root in
Normandy.

The posi-
tion of
Normandy
established
by the

CHAP. IV. and mouths of good Frenchmen, and most likely of good
 Capetian Germans also, the Normans were still simply "the Pirates"
 Revolution. and their sovereign the *Dux Piratarum*. Their presence
 was endured, because they were too strong to be got
 rid of; but the half-heathen Danish intruders were still
 hateful to the princes and people of Latin and Christian
 Gaul. With the election of Hugh Capet all this changed.
 The firmest ally and supporter of the new dynasty could no
 longer be looked on as an outcast or as an enemy. The
 old question as to the relation between Normandy and
 the Kings of Laôn was buried in oblivion. Whatever
 relations had hitherto existed between the Duke of the
 Normans and the King of the French, there was no
 doubt that the Duke of the Normans was the vassal,
 the most powerful and the most loyal vassal, of the Duke
 of the French, and the Duke of the French and the King
 of the French were now one and the same person. Nor-
 mandy was now thoroughly naturalized; the ambiguous
 position which it had held in Carolingian times passed alto-
 gether away; it became the mightiest and noblest among
 the fiefs of the Capetian Crown. And, on the whole, the
 relations between the Duchy and the Crown remained
 friendly. I do not mean that the oath of homage was
 always observed to the letter; I do not mean that every
 Duke of the Normans at all times shrank from waging
 warfare against his liege lord. But, as such obligations
 went in those days, considering the power of the vassal
 and his close neighbourhood to his Lord, the event was
 certainly rare. The rebellions of Hugh the Great alone
 against the Kings whom he had set up and put down
 would probably be found to be more in number than the
 wars between France and Normandy, from the Commen-
 dation of Richard to Hugh to the day when England and
 Normandy alike were merged in the vast dominions of the
 French Princes of Anjou.

Compara-
 tively
 friendly
 relations
 between
 the Duchy
 and the
 Crown.

The close connexion between Norman and French history, the way in which we may say that Normandy created France and that France created Normandy, must be my excuse for dwelling at an apparently disproportionate length on some subjects which are only indirectly connected with English history. In order thoroughly to understand the Norman Conquest of England, it is almost as needful to have a clear view of the condition and earlier history of Normandy as it is to have a clear view of the condition and earlier history of England. And such a clear view of Norman affairs cannot be obtained without constant references to French, and occasional references to German, history. And the notices of French history which are needed for this end may serve to illustrate English history in another way. The contrast between the political condition of England and that of France is most striking, even at this early time. Looked at superficially, there is a certain likeness between the two. In both cases, a King of very limited powers stands at the head of a body of Princes, some of whom, in extent of dominion, might almost—in France not only almost, but altogether—rank as his peers. But, when we come to look more narrowly into the matter, we shall see that the likeness is only superficial. In truth there is very little real likeness at all; and if we admitted a stronger likeness than there is, if we admitted that the two countries had accidentally met at the same point, still their meeting would have been wholly accidental, because the two countries were moving in exactly opposite directions. England was directly tending to unity, France was directly tending to division. In the long run indeed the division to which France was tending paved the way for a closer unity than England ever attained; but, at the moment, it was to division that France was directly tending. The English Kingdom was formed by the gradual union of many distinct states; to

CHAP. IV.

Connexion
of French
history
with the
general
subject.

Contrast
between
the poli-
tical con-
dition of
England
and of
France.

England
tending
to unity,
France to
division.

In England
Princes
had sunk

CHAP. IV.
into Go-
vernors ;

in France
Gover-
nors had
grown into
Princes.

Difference
of the limi-
tations on
the power
of the King
in England
and in
France.

independent Kings had succeeded dependent Kings, and to dependent Kings had succeeded Ealdormen appointed by the King and his Witan. Great and powerful as was an English Ealdorman, he still was not a sovereign, not even a dependent or vassal sovereign; he ruled only with a delegated authority; the King was supreme, and the Ealdorman was only a governor sent by him. In France the process was directly opposite. Local governors who, under the first Carolingian Kings and Emperors, had been simple lieutenants of the sovereign, had gradually grown into hereditary Princes, who at most went through the decent ceremony of receiving their dominions as a grant from a King who could not withhold them. The Dukes, Counts, and Marquesses, of Paris, of Flanders, of Aquitaine, of Septimania, of Barcelona, had thus grown into sovereigns. Starting from the office of an English Ealdorman, they had acquired the formal position, and more than the practical independence, of a vassal King of Wales or Scotland. Normandy was a real fief from the beginning; the grant to Rolf was the exact parallel of the grant to Guthrum; but, during the second half of the tenth century, the dominions of Rolf were ruled by their native sovereign, while the dominions of Guthrum were administered by Ealdormen appointed by the English King. Again, the power of the King was narrowly limited both in England and in France, but it was limited in altogether different ways in the two Kingdoms. The power of the King of the English was limited, because he could do no important act without the consent of his Witan; the power of the King of the French was limited, because he was deprived of all direct authority beyond the narrow limits of Laôn and Compiègne. The King of the English, in the exercise of such authority as the Law gave him, was obeyed in every corner of his Kingdom. The King of the French did as he pleased in his own city of Laôn;

at Paris and Rouen, at Poitiers and Toulouse, he received only such measure of obedience as the sovereigns of those capitals chose to yield to him. No regular Assembly, constantly meeting, like our Witenagemót, had authority over the whole land, and kept the whole land bound together. We read of conferences of Princes, but they are rarely held, except for some great and extraordinary occasion, like the election of a King. An Assembly, meeting yearly or oftener, to sanction the ordinary acts of the King and to pass laws binding on the whole Kingdom, was something utterly unknown.

CHAP. IV.

No regular
National
Assembly
in France.

And yet, when we see how narrow was the immediate dominion, how small were the available resources, of the later Karlings, it strikes us with wonder, throughout the whole history, to see how much influence, how much real power, they retained. The King, however many enemies may be in arms against him, is always an important person, and he commonly finds an army to oppose to the rebel army. We wonder where he got his army, and where he got the resources to set his army in motion. No doubt, in days when war maintained itself, an army was less expensive to keep than it is now, and a victorious army might even enrich its leader. But whence did the armies come? Surely not exclusively from the narrow limits of the King's immediate territory. Nor were they likely to be formed by the spontaneous loyalty of volunteers. The influence of the royal name, the reverence attaching to the blood of the great Emperor, might do a good deal to paralyse the efforts of enemies, but they would hardly of themselves bring troops to the royal standard. But the King, if he had few subjects, was not wholly without friends. We find hints that the lesser vassals often found it their interest to support the King against the encroachments of the great Dukes; we find that, in a war with one rebellious potentate, he was often supported by the rivals

Amount of
real power
retained by
the later
Karlings.The Kings
drew sup-
port from
various
quarters.

CHAP. IV. of that potentate, and that his more distant vassals helped him against those who were more formidable to them than he was; we find that he could especially rely on the help of those Bishops who, holding directly of the Crown, were invested with the character of ecclesiastical princes.¹ And, in the later and more peaceful times of Lothar and Hugh Capet, the King appears far more clearly than before in the character of an effective head of the Kingdom. We read more commonly of consultations with the other princes, and we see the King, by common consent, wielding the forces of all his vassals, including those of the Duke of the French himself. The wily Hugh no doubt saw that it was his interest to strengthen in every way the power and reputation of the crown which he meant one day to place on his own brow. Altogether we may doubt whether the practical power of the later Carolingian Kings was not really quite as great as that of the early Capetians. The power of the Crown rested mainly on influence and prescription, and influence and prescription were not on the side of the Parisian dynasty. The immediate territorial dominion of the Parisian Kings was no doubt much larger than that of the later Karlings; Paris and Laôn together were more valuable than Laôn by itself. But the connexion between the Crown and the great vassals seems to have been distinctly weakened by the change of dynasty. The descendants of Robert and Hugh did not command the hereditary respect which attached to princes sprung from the blood of Charles and Pippin. Some disputed and outlying fiefs were altogether lost to the Kingdom, and the King's sphere of action was far more strictly confined than before to the lands north of the Loire. Lotharingia and the Spanish March fell away; the con-

Increase of
the royal
power un-
der Lothar.

Power of
the Crown
not imme-
diately in-
creased by
the change
of dynasty.

¹ See Flodoard's description of Lewis' invasion of Normandy, A. 944. "Ludowicus Rex in terram Nortmannorum proficiscitur cum Arnulfo et Herluino et quibusdam Episcopis Franciæ ac Burgundiæ."

nexion with Flanders gradually weakened ; Aquitaine scarcely recognized even a nominal dependence. Assemblies and conferences of the whole Kingdom, rare before, seem now to go wholly out of use. Even the vassals north of the Loire, even the former vassals of the Parisian Duchy, seem to have less connexion with the Crown than heretofore. The French Duke lost in some sort by becoming King, just as the German King lost by becoming Emperor. As Duke he had been a less dignified, but he had been a more effectual, over-lord. The Parisian Dukes themselves had done more than all the rest of the world to set forth and strengthen the doctrine that the immediate vassals of a King were entitled to practical sovereignty. Thus, while England was getting more and more united, France was getting more and more divided. Under other circumstances, France might very easily have changed, step by step, from a Kingdom into a Confederation, just as Germany did.¹

But, as it was, the very isolation into which the several parts of the French Kingdom now fell proved in the end the path to an unity such as England never has seen, such as we trust England never may see. French isolation paved the way for French centralization. In England, as the different portions of the realm became more closely united, all shared in a common national freedom without any such complete sacrifice of local and municipal independence. In France, the Crown annexed, one by one, all the dominions of its own vassals,² and such of the dominions of its neighbours as came within its reach. Thus the whole Kingdom knew no will but that of the King. Widely as a modern English Parliament differs from an ancient

Isolation
in France
led to closer
union.

¹ The different circumstances which led to such different results in France and in Germany I trust to point out in the second volume of my History of Federal Government.

² With the exception of the three portions of the kingdom which have become wholly detached. See above, pp. 173, 211.

CHAP. IV. Witenagemót, the one has grown out of the other by gradual development, without any sudden change. In France the ancient Assembly died out altogether, and the comparatively modern States-General came into being as an original device of Philip the Fair.

1302. To return to the more immediate affairs of Normandy. There can be no doubt that the various processes of which I have been speaking, the Christianizing, the Gallicizing, and the feudalizing process, all went on vigorously in Normandy during the reign of Richard the Fearless. The doctrine of nobility was fast growing; it was taking a form quite different from the ancient relations of Eorl and Ceorl, quite different from the later relations of Thegn and Ceorl, as they have been at any time understood in England. Hitherto mere lack of illustrious birth did not keep a man back from the highest offices. The legend that Hugh Capet himself was the son of a butcher of Paris,¹ utterly fabulous as it is, marks the popular belief as to the origin of many of the princely houses of the time. The legends of Lyderic the Forester² and of Torquatus and Tertullus³ point to no very exalted origin on the part of the princely houses of Flanders and Anjou. So it is in the reign of Richard that we find the beginning of the Norman Baronage, and the origin of many of its members was certainly not specially illustrious. Some noble families indeed trace their descent up to old companions of Rolf, such as the house of Harcourt, which claims Bernard the Dane as its patriarch. But the larger part of the Norman nobility derived their origin from the amours or doubtful marriages of the Norman Dukes. Not

Growth of
the doc-
trine of
nobility.

Humble
origin of
many
princely
and noble
houses.

Origin of
the Nor-
man Baron-
age.

¹ Dante, *Purg.* xx.

² For this legend in full, see the early chapters of Oudegherst, *Annales de Flandres*. Lyderic, the foundling, is of course of princely birth. It is the same story as those of Cyrus and Romulus.

³ See *L'Art de vérifier des Dates*, ii. 828.

only their own children, but the families of their wives or mistresses, were carefully promoted by ducal grants or by advantageous marriages. Thus Sprota, the mother of Richard the Fearless, during the troubles of her son's early reign, married one Asperleng, a rich miller. From this marriage sprang Rudolf Count of Ivry, a mighty man in the reign of his nephew, and also several daughters, who were of course well disposed of in marriage.¹ Richard himself, whose marriage with Emma of Paris was childless,² was the father of a large illegitimate or doubtful offspring. Besides undoubted bastards,³ there was a considerable brood, including Richard, the next Duke, and Emma, the future Lady of the English, who were legitimated by Richard's marriage with their mother. These were the children of Gunnor, a woman of Danish birth, to whom different stories attribute a noble and a plebeian origin.⁴ From these children, and from the kinsfolk of Gunnor, all of whom were promoted in one way or another, sprang a large portion of the Norman nobility. Meanwhile the principles of feudalism

Children
and kins-
folk of
Richard.

Progress of
feudal doc-
trines.

¹ Will. Gem. vii. 38. "*Mater ejus Sprota necessitate urgente, contubernio [was there even a Danish marriage?] cujusdam prædivitis nomine Asperlengi adhæsit. Hic, licet in rebus locuples, tamen molendina vallis Ruelii ad firmam solitus erat tenere.*" So M. Jourdain measured cloth only for amusement; so, in some pious legends, Zebedee was a mighty baron of Galilee, whose sons fished for pleasure and not for profit.

² There is something ludicrous in the way in which Dudo (137 B. C), after spending all his powers of prose to set forth the marriage of Emma, goes on to explain in verse that she was not fated to be the mother of a Duke of the Normans.

³ Dudo, 152 C. "*Subscalpenti voluptuosæ humanitatis fragilitati subactus, genuit duos filios, totidem et filias, ex concubinis.*"

⁴ Dudo (u. s.) makes her to be "*ex famosissimâ nobilium Dacorum pro-sapiâ exorta,*" but he allows that the Duke "*eam prohibitis copulationis fœdere sortitus est sibi amicabiliter.*" He marries her ("*inextricabili maritalis fœderis privilegio sibi connectit*") at the advice of the great men of the land. So William of Jumièges (iv. 18) vouches for the nobility of her birth and for her marriage being celebrated "*Christiano more.*" But his continuator (viii. 36) has a curious legend—the same as one of the legends of our Eadgar—to tell about her first introduction to Richard. See also *Roman de Rou*, 5390–5429, &c., 5767–5812.

CHAP. IV. were making fast progress both in Normandy and in France.

Hugh the Great's doctrine of Commendation, practised on so magnificent a scale between the Duchies of Normandy and France, was being everywhere carried out with regard to smaller possessions. Such at least is the natural inference from the general course of events; for it must be remembered that Normandy has, in this age, absolutely nothing to show in the way of written legislation. The

Richard's
grants
to the
Church.

His found-
ation of
Fécamp.

wealth of the clergy was also largely increasing. Richard, unlike his father, was munificent in his gifts to the Church, especially to his new, or rather restored, foundation of Fécamp Abbey.¹ Fécamp, alone among the more famous monasteries of Normandy, stands in the land north-east of the Seine; all the rest lie either in the valley of the river or in the true Norman districts to the west of it. Fécamp, like Westminster, Holyrood, and the Escorial, contained Minster and Palace in close neighbourhood; the spot became a favourite dwelling-place of Richard in his later days,

Dispute
with
Æthelred.
991.

and it was at last the place of his burial. The last years of his reign present only one important event, a dispute, possibly a war, with the English King Æthelred, which was composed by the mediation of Pope John the Fifteenth.

This event, one of some moment in the general view of my history, is passed over alike by the Norman and by the English writers nearest to the time. Yet it seems to rest on quite sufficient evidence. But I reserve its discussion for its place in the next chapter in my more detailed narrative of English affairs. At last, Richard the Fearless, the "Dux Piratarum" as he is called to the last by Richer, died of "the lesser apoplexy," after a reign of fifty-three years. Like several other princes who play a part in the world for an unusual number of years,² one is surprised to find that he was not much older in years than he was. Unlike his

Death of
Richard.
996.

¹ On Fécamp, see Dudo, 153 B et seqq.

² See History of Federal Government, i. 574.

enemies, Arnulf and Theobald, whose lives were really prolonged beyond the common span of human existence, Richard the Fearless, or Richard the Old, as he was called to distinguish him from his successor, after all that he had done and undergone, after all the changes that he had wrought and beheld, had lived no longer than sixty-three years. CHAP. IV.

§ 6. *Early Years of Richard the Good.* 996-997.

The reign of his son, Richard, surnamed the Good, carries us beyond the limits of the present sketch into the essential and central portion of our history. Richard was a direct actor in the events which were the immediate causes of the Conquest. He was the uncle of Eadward the Confessor, the grandfather of William the Bastard; and he personally played a certain part in English affairs. I will therefore reserve his actions for their proper place in my general narrative, and I will here speak of one event, which marks the complete developement of the influences which had been at work throughout the reign of his father. Richard succeeded to the government of a state in which the Danish tongue, Danish manners, perhaps even the old Danish religion, still lingered in particular places, but which was now, in the face of other nations, a French state, a member, and the principal member, of the Capetian commonwealth. He had imbibed to the full all the new-born aristocratic feelings of feudal and chivalrous France. He would have none but gentlemen about him.¹ This is perhaps the earliest use of a word so familiar both in French and in English, but which bears such different meanings in the two languages. But, whatever constituted a gentleman in the language of Richard's court, it is plain that the word took in all who could pretend to any sort of

Reign of
Richard
the Good.
996-1026.

Aristo-
cratic feel-
ings of
Richard.

¹ Roman de Rou, 5955-5974.

CHAP. IV. kindred or affinity, legitimate or illegitimate, with the sovereign. The way in which the exclusively aristocratic household of Richard is spoken of seems to show that his conduct in this respect was felt to be something different from that of his father. Taken in connexion with what follows, it was probably the last pound which broke the camel's back. Popular discontent broke out in the great peasant revolt to which I had occasion to allude earlier in this chapter.¹ We may suppose that the peasantry were mainly of Celtic, Roman, or Frankish origin; that is, they sprang from that mixture of those three elements which produced the modern French nation. But we may well believe that many a man of Scandinavian descent, many a small allodial holder who was unwilling to commend himself to a Lord, threw in his lot with the insurgents. What is most remarkable in the story of this revolt is the regular political organization of the revolters. The systematic way in which they set to work is common enough in cities, but is exceedingly rare in rural communities. It is almost enough to place this revolt of the Norman peasantry side by side with the more famous and more fortunate revolt of the Forest Cantons against the encroachments of Austria. The men who could do as they did were worthy to have sworn at Grütli and to have vanquished at Morgarten. We can hardly believe what we read when we find that these rebellious villains established a regular representative Parliament.² The peasants of each district deputed two of their number to a General Assembly, the decisions of which were to be binding on the whole body.³ The men

Revolt of the Peasants. 997.

Their regular political organization.

They establish a "Commune" with a

¹ Will. Gem. v. 2. Roman de Rou, 5975-6118. See above, p. 195.

² I do not mean merely because the word "parlement" occurs several times in the Roman de Rou. It is there used in its primitive sense, as translating "colloquium."

³ Will. Gem. u. s. "Nam rustici unanimes per diversos totius Normannicæ patriæ comitatus plurima agentes conventicula, juxta suos libitus vivere decernebant. Quatenus, tam in silvarum compendiis quam in

could devise such a system in such an age had CHAP. IV.
 mainly made further steps in political progress than the ^{representative}
 masters against whom they rebelled. The constitution ^{Assembly.}
 which they established is expressly called by a name dear
 to the inhabitants of the cities of those ages, a name
 precious in the eyes of modern political inquirers, but a
 name which was, beyond all other names, a word of fear
 to feudal Barons and Prelates, and to those Kings who
 were not clear-sighted enough to see that their own
 interests and those of their people were the same. The
 peasantry of Normandy, like the citizens of Le Mans,
 "made a Commune."¹ Such a constitution could hardly
 have been extemporized by mere peasants. We can hardly
 doubt that it had a groundwork in local institutions which
 the newly developed aristocracy were trampling under foot,
 and that the so-called rebels were simply defending the in-
 heritance of their fathers. We have the tale only from
 the mouths of enemies; but the long list of popular
 grievances,² and the hostile testimony to the regular
 order with which the rebellion was carried on, are enough
 to show that some very promising germs of freedom
 were here crushed in the bud. The liberty which these
 men sought to establish would have been in truth
 more valuable, because more fairly spread over the whole
 country, than the liberties won by isolated cities. But

*quarum commercia, nullo obistente ante statuti juris obice, legibus
 uterentur sua. Quæ ut rata manerent, ab universis civibus
 vulgi duo eliguntur legati, qui decreta ad medieterraneanam synodalem
 conventum."*

¹ Roman de Rou, 6070.

"Asez tost oi Richard dire

Ke vilains *communes* faisoient."

It does not necessarily follow that the word "*commune*" was used at this
 time, though I know no reason why such may not have been the case. It
 would be quite enough if Wace applied to the name of the commune a
 name which, in his time, had become perfectly familiar, in the popular
 feeling that the earlier movement was essentially a *commune* of the kind.

² Roman de Rou, 6001-6015.

CHAP. IV. the revolt was crushed with horrible cruelty¹ by Rudolf, Count of Ivry, the Duke's uncle, himself a churl by birth, the son of the miller who married the cast-off wife or mistress of Duke William. After this, we hear no more of peasant insurrections in Normandy, but it may well be that the struggle was not wholly fruitless. Villainage in Normandy was lighter, and died out earlier, than in most parts of France; and the most genuine pieces of Norman jurisprudence which remain to this day, the ancient constitutions of the Channel Islands, strange and antiquated as they seem in our eyes, breathe a spirit of freedom worthy of the air of England, of Switzerland, or of Norway.²


The revolt
crushed by
Rudolf of
Ivry.

Probable
results
of the
struggle.

Such was the country and the people, whose history, from the beginning of the eleventh century, becomes inseparably interwoven with that of England. We will now return to our own island, and, taking up the thread of our narrative, we will go on with a more detailed account of English affairs from the beginning of those renewed Danish invasions which paved the way for the still more eventful invasion of the Norman.

¹ Mark the brutal levity with which Rudolf's cruelties are dismissed by William of Jumièges (v. 2). "Qui [Rodulphus] non morans jussa, cunctos confestim legatos cum nonnullis aliis cepit, truncatisque manibus et pedibus, *inutiles* suis remisit, qui eos talibus compescerent, et ne deteriora paterentur suis eventibus cautos redderent. His rustici expertis, festinatò concionibus omissis, ad sua aratra sunt reversi." So Roman de Rou, where various other tortures are spoken of, vv. 6093-6118.

² See Palgrave, iii. 44.



284

CH.
The
crus
Ruc
Ivry

Pro:
resu
of tl
stru

CHAPTER V.

THE DANISH CONQUEST OF ENGLAND.¹

975-1016.

ÆTHELRED the Second, the prince in whose reign England and Normandy first began to have a direct influence on each other's affairs, is the only ruler

¹ Our main authorities for this period are essentially the same as those to which we have to go for our knowledge of earlier times. The English Chronicles are still our principal guide. For the present they may be quoted as one work, the differences between the different manuscripts, pointed out by Mr. Earle in the Preface to his *Parallel Saxon Chronicles*, not being as yet of much strictly historical importance. Florence of Worcester gives what is essentially a Latin version of the Chronicles, with frequent explanatory additions, which his carefulness and sound sense render of great value. The Charters and Laws of the reign of Æthelred are abundant, and, besides their primary value as illustrating laws and customs, the signatures constantly help us to the succession of offices and to a sort of skeleton biographies of the leading men of the time. These, the Chronicles, Laws, and Charters, form our primary authorities. The later Latin Chroniclers, from William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon onwards, occasionally supply additional facts, but their accounts are often mixed up with romantic details, and it is dangerous to trust them, except when they show signs of following authorities which are now lost. This is not uncommonly the case with both Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury. Local histories, like those of Ely, Ramsey, and Abingdon, supply occasional facts, but the same sort of cautions which apply to the secondary writers of general history apply to them in a still greater degree. We now also begin to draw some little help from foreign sources. The Danish History of Saxo Grammaticus, the Chronicles of Swend Aggeßon, the various Sagas, especially the famous Saga of Olaf Tryggvesson, are very difficult to reconcile with the more authentic notices in our own Chronicles; but, among much that is doubtful and much that is clearly fabulous, they often help us to facts, and to the causes and connexions of facts, which our own writers leave obscure. The Norman writers also begin to be of some importance for the events which connect England and Normandy. For the early part of the reign of Æthelred we have no contemporary Norman writer, but the accounts in

CHAP. V.
Character
of Æthel-
red the
Second ;
his dege-
neracy.

of the male line of Ecgberht whom we can unhesitatingly set down as a bad man and a bad King. With singularly few exceptions, the princes of that house form, as we have seen, one of the most glorious series to be found in the annals of any royal dynasty. Of the less brilliant members of the family, some exhibited a balance of virtue and vice which keeps us alike from unqualified praise and from unqualified censure. With regard to others the evidence is so contradictory that we are not justified in pronouncing any positive decision. Others were cut off too young, or reigned too short a time, to give any very certain evidence of what they were. But Æthelred stands alone in presenting the wretched spectacle of a long reign of utter misgovernment, unredeemed, as far as we can see, by any of those personal excellencies which have sometimes caused public errors and crimes to be forgotten. Personal beauty and a certain elegance of manners, qualities consistent with any amount of vice and folly, are the highest merits attributed to a prince, who, instead of the Unconquered, the Glorious, the Magnificent, or the Peaceful, has received no nobler historical surname than that of the Unready.¹ His actions display a certain amount of energy, perhaps rather of mere restlessness. It was at any rate an energy utterly unregulated and misapplied, an energy

the Roman de Rou and in William of Jumièges at least show us what was the Norman tradition. Later in the period, we have, in the *Encomium Emmæ*, the work of a contemporary Norman writer, which, though often unfair and inaccurate, is worthy of being compared with our English writers. Occasional notices of Danish and English affairs are sometimes to be gleaned from the German writers, like Adam of Bremen and the contemporary Thietmar of Merseburg.

On the whole the materials for this period are ample, and, as regards England, they are fully trustworthy. The difficulty lies in reconciling the English and Continental narratives.

¹ On these titles, see above, p. 63. "Unready" must be taken in the sense of "lacking *rede*" or counsel. So the epithet of "Magnificus," applied to Eadmund the First, means rather "worker of great deeds"—the Greek *μεγαλοπράγμων*—than "magnificent" in the vulgar sense.

which began enterprises and never ended them, which **wasted** itself on needless and distant expeditions, while **no effective** resistance was made to the enemy at the **gates**. His reign of thirty-eight years displays little but **the neglect** of every kingly duty, little but weakness, **impolicy**, cowardice, blind trust in unworthy favourites **and even** in detected traitors, acts of injustice and **cruelty**, some of which are laid to the charge of the **King** himself, while others, if he did not himself order, **he at least** did nothing to hinder or to punish. In his **age**, almost everything in the history of a nation depended **on the personal** character of its ruler. One great King **could** raise a Kingdom to the highest point of prosperity; **one weak or wicked** King could plunge it into the lowest **depths of degradation**. So it was with England in the **tenth century**. The fabric of glory and dominion which **was built up** by the labours of Ælfred, Eadward, Æthelstan, Eadmund, and Eadred, and which was firmly welded **together** by the strong and peaceful rule of Eadgar, now **seems to fall to pieces** at the first touch of a vigorous and **determined enemy**. And yet it was not wholly so. The **work of so many conquerors and lawgivers** from Ecgberht **onwards** was not wholly fruitless. England passed into **the hands of a foreign master**; but England passed into **his hands as a single Kingdom**, retaining too her old **dominion over her vassal principalities**. And it should not **be forgotten** how completely the whole evil was due to **incompetent, cowardly, or traitorous leaders**. The heart of **the English people** was still sound. Wherever a brave and **honest man** was in local command, local resistance was as **vigorous as it could have been** under Ælfred himself. And, **in the last agony**, when valour and wisdom **seemed** all too **late**, Eadmund, the glorious son of the wretched Æthelred, **stood forth like one of the old heroes of his house**, won **back half the land** from the invader, and lost **the rest** far

Import-
ance of the
personal
character
of rulers.

The Eng-
lish needed
only
worthy
leaders
of the
people.

CHAP. V. more through guile and treason than through open warfare. The thing which is utterly inexplicable throughout the reigns both of Æthelred and of Eadmund is the strange and incomprehensible treason of two or three Englishmen in high command. It is equally strange how their treachery could repeatedly paralyse the efforts of a whole nation, and how, after their repeated treasons, the traitors were again taken into favour and confidence by the princes whom they had betrayed. Our facts are minute and explicit; but we often need some explanation of their causes which is not forthcoming. A few of those private letters of which we have such abundance two or three centuries later, would give us the key to many difficulties which Chronicles, Laws, and Charters leave wholly insoluble.

§ 1. *Reign of Eadward the Martyr. 975-979.*

Death of
Eadgar.
975.

Eadgar was succeeded by his eldest son Eadward, whose treacherous murder, though he did not die in any cause of religion or patriotism, has gained him the surname of the Martyr. But he did not succeed without an interregnum, without a disputed election, or even without something approaching to a civil war. It shows how thoroughly we are now standing on the firm ground of contemporary history that we can recover a distinct portraiture of many of the

Movement
against
the monks,
headed by
Ælfhere of
Mercia;

actors in these scenes. The moment Eadgar was dead, a re-action took place against the monastic party, which was met by as powerful a movement on their behalf. Ælfhere, the Ealdorman of the Mercians and a kinsman of Eadgar,¹ headed

¹ In Florence, A. 983, he is called "Regis Anglorum Eadgari propinquus," probably implying kindred by the mother's side. His name is affixed to most of the Charters of the time, and many acts in Mercia are stated to be done by his consent. See, for instance, a Charter of Bishop Oswald (Cod. Dipl. iii. 5), where he bears the title of "Heretoga." The Chronicles (A. 975), followed by Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 748 C), who calls him "consul nequissimus," charge him with actually destroying monasteries. Florence speaks only of his bringing in married priests and

the movement against the monks, and drove them out of several churches into which Eadgar's favour had introduced them. But the monks found powerful supporters in the eastern part of the kingdom, where their cause was strongly supported, it would seem even in arms,¹ by two remarkable men who then held the governments of East-Anglia and Essex. Æthelwine of East-Anglia, one of the founders of Ramsey Abbey,² is chiefly known for his bounty to monastic foundations, to whose gratitude he probably owed his singular surname of the Friend of God.³ With him was associated his maternal uncle Brihtnoth,⁴ Ealdorman

CHAP. V.
and resisted by Æthelwine of East-Anglia and Brihtnoth of Essex.

their wives. In some cases it appears that former owners of lands then in monastic occupation laid legal claims to them as having been taken from them unjustly. See Hist. El. lib. i. c. 5, 8. It is curious to find among these claimants against the monastery of Ely no less a person than Ealdorman Æthelwine himself. Hist. El. lib. i. c. 5. Æthelwine, worshipped at Ramsey, was thought much less of at Ely, just as we shall find Harold spoken of very differently at Wells and at Waltham.

¹ Fl. Wig. A. 975. "Congregato exercitu, monasteria Orientalium Anglorum maxima strenuitate defenderunt."

² Fl. Wig. A. 975, 991. Hist. Rams. 387. Gale. Æthelwine was the youngest son of Æthelstan, surnamed the Half-King (Hist. Rams., u. s.), Ealdorman of the East-Angles, who seems to have died about 967, when we find his last signature (Cod. Dipl. iii. 14). He had four sons, Æthelwold, Ælfwold, Æthelsige (?), and Æthelwine. Of these, the eldest and youngest were successively associated with him in the government of East-Anglia. Æthelwold, whose widow Ælfthryth married King Eadgar in 964 (when Florence calls him "gloriosus Dux Orientalium Anglorum"), signs several charters as *Dux* down to 962, probably the year of his death. From that year his youngest brother Æthelwine takes his place. It is not easy to see why Ælfwold was excluded, as he survived in a private station, and assisted his brother the Ealdorman. Fl. Wig. A. 975, 992. Æthelwine died in this last year. The portentous title of "Totius [Orientalis ?] Angliæ Aldermannus," said (see Hist. Rams. p. 462) to have been inscribed on his grave, is hardly credible, but it has its parallels in the title of "Dux Francorum," borne by the contemporary Lords of Paris, and that of "Dux Anglorum" given by the Bayeux Tapestry to Harold when Earl of the West-Saxons.

Æthelsige the third brother signs many charters with the title of "minister," that is, Thegn.

³ "Amicus Dei." Fl. Wig. 975, 991, 992, 1016.

⁴ Of the many spellings of this and kindred names I prefer *Brihtnoth*, *Brithtric*, and the like. The form *briht*, our modern *bright*, was now sup-

CHAP. V. of the East-Saxons,¹ whose lavish gifts to Ely, Ramsey, and other monasteries, won him well nigh the reputation of a saint, and whom we shall soon find dying a hero's death in the defence of his country against heathen invaders. More interesting however, in a constitutional point of view, than these ecclesiastical disputes is the controversy as to the succession to the crown. The election of a minor is, in any case, a thing to be noticed, and a dispute between two minors is more remarkable still. Eadgar had left two sons, Eadward, aged about thirteen, the son of his first wife Æthelflæd, and Æthelred, aged seven years, the child of his second wife, Ælfthryth, the daughter of Ordgar and widow of Æthelwold, who, under the Latinized name of Elfrida, has been made the subject of so much strange romance.² Had Eadgar left a brother behind him, there can be no doubt that he would, like Ælfred and Eadred, have been placed on the throne by universal consent. But there was no son of Eadmund living; indeed it is not clear that there was any male descendant of Ælfred living at all. There were indeed persons, like Æthelweard the historian,³ who were descended in the male line from Æthelwulf and Ecgberht; but, in such distant kinsmen, some unusual personal merit would probably have been needed to bring their claims on the crown into any notice. At this moment, there was no grown

Disputed election to the Crown.

State of the succession; a minority unavoidable.

planting the earlier *beorht*. *Beorhtic* and *Brihtic* may thus pass as the recognized earlier and later shapes of the same name, while any other form must be set down as more or less anomalous.

¹ Fl. Wig. 975. Hist. Rams. 432. Hist. Eli. Gale, 493, where he is inaccurately made Earl of the Northumbrians. Brihtnoth's sister Æthelflæd was wife of Æthelstan the Half-King (Hist. El. ii. 8), so that Æthelstan's sons were probably Brihtnoth's nephews.

² For a full examination of her story, I would refer to the article in the Fortnightly Review, quoted above, p. 9.

³ "Fabius Quæstor Patricius Æthelwerdus," as he thinks good to call himself, the author of the earliest and most meagre of our Latin Chronicles, was descended (see his own Prologue) from one of the sons of Æthelred the First who were excluded to make way for Ælfred (see above, p. 59).

man among the immediate members of the royal family, and there was no one, either among strangers or among more distant kinsmen, who possessed the predominant merit and predominant influence which marked out Harold for the crown ninety years later. The evils of a minority had therefore to be endured. Yet it seems strange that, if a minor King was to be accepted, there could be any doubt as to which minor was to be chosen. Eadward is said to have been distinctly recommended by his father, and with good reason. He was the elder son, and though primogeniture gave no positive right,¹ yet it would surely be enough to turn the scale, even in a doubtful case, and this case, one would have thought, was not doubtful. The election of Eadward would have the unspeakable advantage of bringing the minority to an end six years sooner than the election of his brother. Yet we read, on excellent authority,² that there was a distinct division of sentiment among the electors, and that a strong party supported the child Æthelred against the boy Eadward.³ In this we can hardly fail to see the influence of the Queen Dowager⁴ Ælfthryth, in alliance with one of the two parties in the state. And there is every reason to believe that the party of Ælfthryth was the party of the monks. She was, by

Party of
Ælfthryth
and the
monks.

¹ Compare the case of Æthelwine's succession to the Ealdormanship of East-Anglia to the exclusion of Ælfwold.

² Fl. Wig. 975.

³ The ground alleged in Eadmer's Life of Dunstan (Anglia Sacra, ii. 220), that Eadward was not the son of a crowned King and Queen, would not be so utterly frivolous as it sounds, if both brothers, as Dr. Lappenberg remarks, were not equally liable to the objection. The argument was used long after on behalf of Henry the First against his elder brothers. Cf. Herod. vii. 2-3. Probably all that was meant was that Eadward had no *preference* on this ground (see above, p. 117), so that the two lads were candidates on equal terms. The fears said (Eadmer, u. s., and Osbern, Ang. Sac. i. 113) to have been entertained from the character of the boy Eadward seem still less to the purpose.

⁴ The more correct description would be "the Old Lady." See Chron. (Abingdon), 1051.

CHAP. V. her first marriage, the sister-in-law of Æthelwine, and we find several signs that Dunstan and the monks were not so all-powerful under Eadward as they had been under his father. It was therefore a distinct sacrifice of their party to their country, when Dunstan and his fellow Archbishop Oswald settled the controversy by a vigorous appeal on behalf of Eadward, urging the will of the late King, and no doubt enlarging also on the manifest expediency of the choice. Eadward was accordingly elected, crowned, and anointed. But that his short reign was not wholly favourable to the monastic party may be inferred by the continuance of the controversy, and the holding of several synods to discuss the points at issue.¹ We may see a similar influence at work in the banishment of Earl Oslac, a special favourite of Eadgar's, whose punishment and its injustice are bitterly lamented by our best authorities.² It will be remembered that, when the last Northumbrian King was overthrown by Eadred, the government of the country was entrusted to an Earl of the King's choice. Oswulf,³ thus appointed by Eadred, ruled over all Northumberland, till Eadgar again divided the old Kingdoms of Bernicia and Deira, giving the northern province to Oswulf and the southern to Oslac. On Oslac's banishment, the whole seems to have been again united under Waltheof,⁴ who

Patrotic conduct of Dunstan, and election of Eadward.

Banishment of Earl Oslac.

954.

966.

¹ See Eadmer, u. s., Osbern, 112, and Lingard's note, Hist. of England, i. 274.

² Fl. Wig. A. 976. The poems in the Chronicles certainly seem to me to connect the banishment of Oslac with the predominance of Ælfhere and the anti-monastic party.

³ Oswulf seems to have been the son of Ealdred of Bamborough, who did homage to Æthelstan in 926 (see above, p. 62). He signs two Charters of Eadred in 949 as Lord of Bamborough; "Osulf ad bebb. hehgŕ.", whatever this last abbreviation may stand for (Cod. Dipl. ii. 292), and "Osulf bebb." (ii. 296). In 954 he seems to have exchanged this infinitesimal sort of kingship for the Earldom over the whole country. See Simeon of Durham (Gest. Reg. X Scriptt. 204).

⁴ I infer this from the words of Simeon (u. s.), "*Hic* [Oslaco et Osulfo] successit Walthef senior." Yet, if so, he must have been at a later time

was probably of the family of Oswulf, and of whose own descendants we shall often hear again. CHAP. V.

§ 2. *From the election of Æthelred to the first dispute with Normandy. 979-1000.*

Eadward, after a four years' reign, was cruelly murdered. Murder of Edward and election of Æthelred. 979.
 There is little doubt that this foul deed was done at least by the instigation of his step-mother Ælfthryth,¹ whose son Æthelred was now elected at the age of ten years.
 For thirty-seven years England was governed by him or in his name, and after Dunstan was gone, the reign of Æthelred meant only the reign of his unworthy favourites. Death of Dunstan. 988.
 The world soon learned how great was the change when the Imperial sceptre of Britain was no longer grasped by the hand of Eadgar the Peaceful. Æthelred had not been two years on the throne when the Danish invasions began again. The whole interest of the history so completely centres on this fearful scourge that we may pass swiftly by the few, and mostly unfortunate, events of internal history which are handed down to us. In one year London was burned, London burned. 982. (Chron. and Flor. Wig.) seemingly by one of those accidental fires which, then and long after, were so common and so destructive in cities where the buildings were mainly of wood. In another year, owing to some internal sedition the cause of which is not explained, Æthelred, then a youth of seventeen, besieged the town of Rochester, and being unable to take it, Siege of Rochester. 986.

deprived of the southern province, as we shall find Deira held by Ælfhelm from about 993 to 1006, while Waltheof was still in office.

¹ The Chronicles bitterly lament the crime, without mentioning the criminal. Florence distinctly charges Ælfthryth with it. In the hands of William of Malmesbury (ii. 162) the story becomes a romance, which gets fresh details in those of Bromton (X Scriptt. 873 et seqq.). The *obiter dictum* of William of Malmesbury (ii. 165), that Ælfhere had a hand in Eadward's death, is contrary to the whole tenor of the history. See Chron. 980. Fl. Wig. 979.

CHAP. V. ravaged the lands of the Bishoprick.¹ In another year we
 987. hear of an epidemic fever, and of a murrain among beasts,
 seemingly the forerunner of the modern cattle-plague,
 which raged through the whole of England in a way un-
 known to former times.² Besides these misfortunes of
 different kinds, Ælfhere of Mercia died, and was succeeded
 in his Ealdormanship by his son Ælfric, who, some years
 afterwards, was banished, we are not told for what cause.
 The first marriage of Æthelred to the daughter of one of his
 nobles, whose name and parentage are uncertain,³ and the
 birth of his eldest son Eadmund, afterwards the renowned
 Ironside,⁴ are also placed within this period.

Death of
 Ælfhere.
 983.

Banish-
 ment of
 Ælfric.
 986.

The Danish
 invasions
 renewed ;

first, with
 mere plun-
 dering in-
 cursions,
 [980-982];

From these obscure domestic events we turn to the
 terrible drama of the Danish wars. This new series of
 invasions, those which led in the end to the submission
 of all England to a Danish King, are those which form
 the third and last period of Danish warfare. But the
 third period, after so long an interval, is as it were ushered
 in by a kind of repetition of the two earlier periods. Be-
 fore the great attack on the Kingdom of England by a
 King of all Denmark, we find a short period of mere
 plunder and a short period of attempted settlement. Dur-
 ing the first years of Æthelred, the Danish invasions once
 more become mere piratical incursions. Then for a few

¹ Chron. and Fl. Wig. in anno. The beginnings of a legendary version may be seen in William of Malmesbury (ii. 165) and Roger of Wendover (i. 423).

² Fl. Wig. 987. The English and Welsh Chronicles both put the cattle-plague a year earlier, and do not mention the disease among men.

³ William of Malmesbury (ii. 179) professes ignorance of her name. Æthelred's namesake, the Abbot of Rievaulx (X Scriptt. 362), calls her the daughter of Thored, a chief who was employed by Eadgar to ravage Westmoreland, and whom we hear of again in this reign. But the higher authority of Florence calls her Ælfgifu, daughter of Ealdorman Æthelberht. Gen. Reg. West Sax. vol. i. p. 275, Thorpe.

⁴ Roger of Wendover (i. 422) places Eadmund's birth in 981, when Æthelred was only twelve years old.

years they cease altogether. Then they begin a second time, in a shape which seems to imply intended settlement, and which presently grows into regular political conquest. The leading spirit of all these invasions was Swend, the son of Harold Blaataand, the Danish King who played so important a part in the affairs of Normandy. And for a while there appears by his side another rover of the North, whose career was, if possible, stranger than his own, the famous Olaf Tryggwesson of Norway. But it is hard indeed to force the entries in the English Chronicles, which hardly ever touch upon the internal affairs of Scandinavia,¹ into agreement with the half fabulous narratives in the Danish historian and in the Norwegian Sagas. Swend, baptized in his infancy, and held at the font by an Imperial godfather, had received the name of Otto, as Guthrum received the name of Æthelstan.² But he cast away his new name and his new faith, and waged war against his Christian father on behalf of Thor and Odin.³ The life of Olaf, as told in the Sagas of his country,⁴ is one of the most amazing either in history or in romance. The posthumous child of a murdered King and a fugitive Queen, he is sold as a slave in Esthonia, he flourishes through court favour in Russia, he wins principalities by marriage in Wendland and in England, and is converted to Christianity by an Abbot in the Scilly Islands. The early life of Swend too is connected by tradition with England; he is said to have been driven from Denmark, to have sought for shelter in England, and, when repelled by Æthelred, to have taken refuge for a time at the more hospitable court of Kenneth

CHAP. V.

then attempts at settlement, [988-993].

Characters of Swend of Denmark and Olaf of Norway.

¹ This is in marked contrast to the affairs of the Empire, on which our Chroniclers evidently kept a careful eye, and of which they contain many notices.

² He is called Suein Otto by Adam of Bremen, ii. 25.

³ Adam Brem. u. s. Sax. Gram. lib. x. p. 185, ed. Hafn. 1644.

⁴ See the "Saga om Oloff Tryggwason," "Historia Olai Tryggwæ Fili," Upsala, 1691, or Laing's Sea-Kings of Norway, i. 367.

- CHAP. V. of Scotland.¹ It is highly probable that Swend took a part as a private Wiking in the first three years of piracy, which chiefly devastated the shores of Wessex and Kent. The presence of Olaf in England may also be inferred from the statement that Cheshire was ravaged by enemies who are distinctly pointed out as Norwegians.² That Swend indeed had a hand in the earlier incursions is almost proved by an interval of peace succeeding them. This interval doubtless represents the time of Swend's parricidal war with his father, which quite sufficiently accounts for the cessation of his attacks upon England. After six years' intermission, the invasions began again with an attack on Watchet on the northern coast of Somersetshire, in which several English Thegns were killed, but the Danes were at last beaten off.³ Three years later, a much more serious attack was made on the East of England, seemingly with the intention of making a settlement. This seems to have been a Norwegian expedition; the leaders were Justin and Guthmund, sons of Steitan, and there seems every reason to believe that Olaf Tryggwesson himself was present also.⁴
- Cessation of inroads. 982-988.
- They begin again. Battle at Watchet. 988.
- Norwegian invasion. 991.
- Plunder of Ipswich.
- They plundered Ipswich and thence advanced into Essex, where the brave Ealdorman Brihtnoth met them in battle

¹ Adam Brem. ii. 32. Saxo, lib. x. p. 188. Swend, already King, is driven out by Eric of Sweden. To reconcile the chronology is hopeless. Saxo calls the English King Eadward. Adam says, "*Britannia* Adelrad filius Edgaris *imperavit*." Is this accidental, or did he refer to the Imperial style of our Kings?

² Chron. A. 980. "And þý ilcan geare wæs Legeceasterscír gehergod fram norð scipherige." Florence has, more distinctly, "*Civitatis Legionum provincia à Norwegensibus piratis devastatur*." Northmen of all kinds are often confounded under the name of Danes, but none but genuine Norwegians are likely to be spoken of in this way. Leicester here, as often, is not the midland Leicester, but Chester.

³ Chron. Fl. Wig. in anno. "Goda the Devonshire Thegn" was killed, according to the Chronicles. Florence calls him "Satrapa Domnanie," as if he had been Ealdorman of the shire.

⁴ The Chronicles give no names; Florence mentions Justin and Guthmund; but the treaty presently to be mentioned, gives the name of Olaf as well.

at Maldon.¹ The hero of the monks was also the hero of the soldiers, and the exploits and death of the valiant Ealdorman were sung in strains which rank among the noblest efforts of Teutonic poetry.² It is a relief to turn from the wretched picture of misgovernment and treachery which the reign of Æthelred presents, and to hear the deeds of one of the few righteous who were left told in our own ancient tongue in verses which echo the true ring of the battle-pieces of Homer. The fight of Maldon is the only battle of the days of Æthelred of which any minute

CHAP. V.
Battle of
Maldon
and death
of Briht-
noth.

¹ Of Brihtnoth, see above, p. 289. I imagine this to be Brihtnoth the Thegn to whom a grant of land is made by Eadgar in 967 (Cod. Dipl. iii. 15), and who signs as "Minister," another person of the same name signing as "Dux." This elder Ealdorman Brihtnoth can be traced back to the beginning of Eadgar's reign. It is not easy to say to which of these two Brihtnoths the signatures of "Brihtnoth Dux" in the latter years of Eadgar belong. But it is certain that our Brihtnoth had attained the rank of Ealdorman before the death of Eadgar in 975. In 991 he was an old man, "Hár hilde-rinc." It should be noticed that Brihtnoth the Thegn gives the lands granted him by the King to the Church of Worcester, an act eminently characteristic of our Brihtnoth.

The accounts of Brihtnoth in the Histories of Ely and Ramsey seem mixed up with a good deal of fable. They both (Ramsey, c. lxxi. Ely, lib. ii. c. 6) tell a story how the Ealdorman, on his march against the Danes, came to Ramsey and asked for food for his army. The niggardly Abbot Wulfsige would entertain the Ealdorman and a few select companions, but would not undertake to feed the whole host. Brihtnoth, like Alexander, will partake of nothing in which all his soldiers cannot share, and marches on to Ely, where Abbot Ælfsige receives the whole multitude. Brihtnoth accordingly gives to the Abbey of Ely certain lands which he had intended for that of Ramsey. This is hardly history; we recognize too clearly the stories of Gideon and the elders of Succoth and of David and Abiathar the Priest. It is also hard to see how a march from any part of Brihtnoth's government to Maldon could lead him by either Ramsey or Ely. The Ely history escapes this difficulty by making him Earl of the Northumbrians instead of the East-Saxons, and by making two battles of Maldon. Brihtnoth, victorious in the former, returns to Northumberland; the Danes land again; Brihtnoth comes from Northumberland, taking the two Abbeys on his march; he then fights the second battle, in which, after *fourteen days* of combat, he is killed.

² The original Old-English text is printed in Thorpe's *Analecta Anglo-Saxonica*, p. 131; there is a modern English translation in Conybeare's *Illustrations of Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, xc.

CHAP. V. details are preserved,¹ and every detail throws light on something in the manners or the military tactics of the age. The battle took place near the town of Maldon, on the banks of the tidal river Panta, now called the Blackwater. The town lies on a hill; immediately at its base flows one branch of the river, while another, still crossed by a mediæval bridge, flows at a little distance to the north. The Danish ships seem to have lain in the branch nearest to the town, and their crews seem to have occupied the space between the two streams, while Brihtnoth came to the rescue from the north. He seems to have halted on the spot now occupied by the church of Heybridge,² having both streams between him and the town. He rode to the spot, but when he had drawn up his army in order, he alighted from his horse and took his place among his own household troops.³ These were men bound to him by that traditional tie of personal fidelity handed on from the days of the earliest records of the Teutonic race. Like Harold at Senlac, Brihtnoth fought on foot; an English King or Ealdorman used his horse only to carry him to and from the field of battle; in the actual combat the first in rank

¹ The poem, of which unfortunately the beginning and ending are lost, is evidently local and contemporary. I therefore do not hesitate to accept the main facts of the battle and the names of the actors as trustworthy; much more so than if they were found in a Latin prose chronicle a century or two later. The speeches, no doubt, are, like most speeches in history, the invention of the poet.

² The church, a massive Romanesque building, may not unlikely have been raised, like so many other churches on battle-fields, to commemorate the event.

³ "þa he hæfde þæt folc
fægre getrymmed,
he lihte þa mid leodon,
þær him leofost wæs,
þær he his heorð-werod
holdost wiste." (Thorpe, p. 132.)

This "heorð-werod" or *hearth company* are the personal following or *comitatus* (see above, p. 91) of the chief; to their exploits the poem is chiefly devoted.

was bound to share every danger of his lowlier comrades.¹ The Wikings now sent a herald, offering to withdraw and go back to their ships, on payment of money to be assessed at their own discretion. Brihtnoth of course indignantly refused any such demand; steel, and not gold, was the only metal that could judge between him and them. The two hosts now stood on opposite sides of the water, a deep and narrow channel, which, as the tide was coming in, could not be at once crossed. The bridge, a still older predecessor, no doubt, of that which still remains was occupied, at Brihtnoth's order, by three champions whose exploit reminds us, like some other incidents of the battle, of one of the most famous tales in the poetical history of Rome. The dauntless three who kept the bridge at Maldon were Wulfstan the son of Ceola, Ælfhere, and Maccus, the name of which last champion may suggest some curious inquiries as to his origin.² Till the tide turned, the two armies stood facing each other, eager for battle, but unable to do more than exchange a few flights of arrows. At last the turn of

¹ William of Malmesbury says of Harold (iii. 241), "*Rex ipse pedes juxta vexillum stabat cum fratribus, ut, in commune periculo sequato, nemo de fugâ cogitaret.*" This description applies equally to Brihtnoth at Maldon.

Mr. Conybeare surely mistook the meaning of the passage and the tactics of the English army, when he translated the words, "and þone stede healdan," "how to guide their *steeds*." I understand it to mean "how to hold their *stead*" or place. Brihtnoth is bidding his men form a firm rank with the "board-wall" or line of shields—

"Hu hi sceoldon standan,
And þone stede healdan,
And bæd þæt hyra randan
Rihte heoldon
Fæste mid folmum,
And ne forhtedon na." (p. 132.)

There was no place for horses with such tactics as these.

² The only other Maccus whom I know anything of is the under-King of Man, who was one of the princes who rowed Eadgar on the Dee. But what could he, or any one of his family or nation, be doing in the *Comitatus* of an Ealdorman of the East-Saxons?

CHAP. V. the tide made the ford passable; the Northmen began to cross, and Brihtnoth, with a sort of chivalrous feeling which was doubtless utterly thrown away upon such enemies, allowed large numbers of them to pass unhindered. And now the fight began in earnest. The English stood, as at Senlac, in the array common to them and their enemies, a strong line, or rather wedge, of infantry, forming a wall with their shields. As in the old Roman battles, the fight began with the hurling of the javelins, and was carried on in close combat with the broadsword.¹ Brihtnoth was wounded early in the battle, and his sister's son Wulfmær was disabled. But the brave old chief went on fighting, and, after slaying several Wikings with his own hand, he was cut down, and two gallant followers who fought at his side were slain with him. One of these was another Wulfmær, the young son of Wulfstan, who fought by his lord while his father was guarding the bridge. After the death of the valiant Ealdorman, the thoroughly Homeric character of the story comes out more strongly than ever. The fight over the body of Brihtnoth sounds like the fight over the body of Patroklos,² or like that later day when

“Fiercer grew the fighting
Around Valerius dead.”

¹ The weapon of close fight at Maldon, as at Brunanburh, was the sword. I find no distinct mention of the axe, which, seventy years later, was the special weapon of the picked men of an English army. The *bill* is twice mentioned, and it is put into the hand of Brihtnoth himself; but it is plain that the bill here spoken of was a sword and not an axe—

“ Ða Byrhtnoð bræd
Bill of sceðe,
Brád and brún-ecg.” (p. 136.)

Earlier in the poem the defensive and offensive weapons of the English appear distinctly as “Bord and brád swurd.” The axe, a Danish as well as an English weapon, was probably brought into England from the North; but at Maldon it does not appear on either side. The early use of the epithet “brown” to a sword, common in later ballads, should be noticed.

² The likeness struck Mr. Conybeare strongly. p. lxxxviii.

Two caitiffs, the only faithless ones among the body- CHAP. V.

guard of the fallen hero, two brothers whose names are handed down to infamy as Godric and Godwig, the sons of Odda, forgot their duty to their lord who had shown them such favours, and fled from the field, leaving his body in the hands of his enemies. Godric even added the further treason of mounting the horse on which Brihtnoth had ridden to the field, so that many thought that it was the Ealdorman himself who had fled.¹ The English were thus thrown into confusion; the fortress of shields was broken.² The enemy had thus time to mangle the body of Brihtnoth, and to carry off his head as a trophy.³ But the fight was renewed by Brihtnoth's special comrades, whose names and exploits are handed down to us in verses breathing the true fire of the warlike minstrelsy common to Greek and Teuton. There fought Ælfwine the son of Ælfric, of a lordly house among the Mercians;⁴ there fought Æseferth the son of Ecglaf, a Northumbrian hostage who had escaped from the enemy;⁵ there fought Brihtwold, old in years but valiant among the foremost; there fought Eadward the Long, and Leofsunu, and others whose names live only in the nameless poet's verse, but

Faithfulness of the comitatus of Brihtnoth.

¹ So I understand the lines,

“Wende pæs for-moni man
þa he on meare rád,
On wlancan þam wicge,
þæt wære hit ure hlaford.” (p. 138.)

² The fortress of shields; in German one might perhaps still venture to say “schildburg.”

“Forþan wearð her on felda
Folc totwæmed,
Scyld-burh tobrocen.” (p. 138.)

³ So says the Ely History (ii. 6), which, on such a point, may be trusted. The Abbot supplied the loss with a mass of wax.

⁴ Is this Ælfwine a son of the banished Ealdorman Ælfric? Ælfwine Minister, occasionally, but not very commonly, signs Charters about this time.

⁵ So I understand the passage, as does Mr. Conybeare. But we have no mention of any inroad of this army into Northumberland.

CHAP. V. among whom one must not be forgotten, one whose description shows that, deep as were the corruptions of English life under this wretched reign, there was at least room left for lowly merit to raise itself to honour. This was Dun-
 nere, a churl by birth, but whose rank is spoken of without the least shadow of contempt, and whose words and deeds placed him on a level with the noblest of his comrades. In short, the whole personal following of the East-Saxon Ealdorman seems to have fought and fallen around his body. The heathen had the victory;¹ but the defeat of the English seems to have been by no means decisive. We do not read that the Danes were able to spoil or burn the town, according to their usual custom, and the body of Brihtnoth was carried off in safety, and found a worthy resting-place. On an island in the great fen region between Mercia and East-Anglia, on an elevation which, in that part of the island, passes for a considerable hill, the Virgin Queen Æthelthryth (the Etheldreda of hagiology) had, three centuries before, forsaken every duty of royal and married life, to rule over a sisterhood which proved fruitful in saints of royal birth.² Thus arose the great monastery of Ely; but, like many other religious houses, it was utterly destroyed in the great Danish invasion. When the monks were in the height of their power under Eadgar, Bishop Æthelwold, their chief patron, chose the forsaken site for a new foundation; a church was built, and a body of monks took possession of the former home of sainted princesses. Among the benefactors of the new house the pious Ealdorman of the East-Saxons was one of the chief. The first Abbot, whether from kindred or from accident, bore the same name as his benefactor the Ealdorman. He,

His burial
at Ely.

¹ Fl. Wig. A. 991. "Utrique infinita multitudine cæsa, ipse Dux occubuit, Danica vero fortuna vicit." The Ely historian tries hard to represent the battle as a victory.

² See her life in Bæda, iv. 19, 20.

according to the legend, died a martyr's death, through the machinations of Queen Ælfthryth, the unworthy niece of the pious chieftain.¹ The second Abbot Ælsige was connected with Brihtnoth by the tie of mutual benefits.² He now hastened to the place of slaughter, and carried off the body of so great a benefactor of his house. The remains of Brihtnoth were buried in the newly hallowed minster, the humble predecessor of the most stately and varied of England's cathedral churches. Under its mighty lantern the brave and pious Ealdorman slept in peace, till, under pretence of restoration, his bones were disturbed by the savages of the eighteenth century. His widow Æthelflæd shared his devotion to the house of Saint Æthelthryth. She added to his gifts of land; she offered a bracelet, probably part of the insignia of his office; and she adorned the minster with one gift, which, if it survived, would rank among the most precious monuments of the history and art of the age. Ely once could rival Bayeux; the industry and the conjugal love of the widow of the East-Saxon Ealdorman were no less famous than those of the wife of the Norman King. Among the choicest treasures of Ely under her first Bishop, a hundred and twenty years later, was the elaborate tapestry on which the devotion of Æthelflæd had wrought the glorious deeds of the hero of Maldon.³

CHAP. V.

Gifts of his
widow
Æthelflæd;
the Ely
Tapestry.

¹ The Ely History (ii. 3) gives the legend. With the slight improvement of representing Ælfthryth as a witch, it is the story of Joseph and Zuleikha, or of Bellerophontês and Anteia, over again, with such changes as were needed when it was transferred from a married woman to a widow. It should be remembered that Ælfthryth's first husband Æthelwold was apparently a nephew of Brihtnoth.

² See the story above, p. 297 note.

³ Hist. El. ii. 7. "Torquem auream, et cortinam [curtain] gestis viri sui intextam atque depositam, depictam in memoriam probitatis ejus, huic ecclesiæ donavit." See Palgrave, Eng. Com. ii. cccvi. Lingard, i. 278. Whether the Bayeux Tapestry is really the work of Queen Matilda is a point which I shall examine elsewhere. But the tradition to that effect is enough for the purpose of my present parallel.

CHAP. V. At Maldon the invaders had gained a victory, but it was a victory which showed what Englishmen could still do when they had men of the old stamp to lead them. But the dastardly flight of the sons of Odda showed that England also contained men of another temper. And unhappily the policy of Æthelred was now guided by men of the stamp of Godric, not by men of the stamp of Brihtnoth. The ignominious payment of money, which the brave old Ealdorman had so indignantly refused, was the only means of safety which suggested itself to a King in the first vigour of youth, and to his chief counsellors in Church and State. The year which beheld the fight of Maldon beheld also, for the first time, peace bought by the Lord of all Britain from a few ship-crews of heathen pirates. This was the beginning of that senseless and fatal system of looking to gold to do the work of steel, of trusting to barbarians who never kept their promises, and who naturally, as soon as they had spent one instalment of tribute, came back again to extort more. But this obvious lesson was one which Æthelred and his advisers seemed never able to learn. The spirit of the nation, which, under men like Brihtnoth, was ready for vigorous resistance, was thus quenched, and its energy frittered away. The evil counsellors who stand charged with the infamy of first suggesting this unhappy measure were men of the highest rank in the nation. The great Dunstan was dead; he was taken away from the evil to come in the very year in which the invasions began again. After a momentary occupation of the metropolitan throne by Æthelgar, Bishop of Selsey, who died the next year, the primacy fell to the lot of Sigeric, Bishop of Ramsbury. The first act of this prelate was to drive out the secular priests from the metropolitan church, where, strange to say, Dunstan had tolerated them.¹

The Danes
first bought
off.
991.

Advisers
of the
measure;

Sigeric,
Arch-
bishop of
Canter-
bury,
[990-994];

¹ Fl. Wig. A. 990. "Clericis a Cantuariâ proturbatis, monachos induxit."

If Sigeric was at all versed in the appropriate learning CHAP. V. of his office, the history of the Old Testament might have supplied him with abundant precedents to show the fatal nature of his policy. No Jewish King had ever gained anything by buying off the Assyrian, and an English King was not likely to fare any better by buying off the Dane. But Sigeric joined with the Ealdormen Æthelweard and Ælfric in gaining the King's leave to purchase peace for their own districts at the hands of the invaders.¹ Æthelweard, "Patricius Consul Fabius Ealdorman Quæstor Ethelwerdus,"² was a man of royal descent, Æthel-
weard, who is memorable as our only lay historian of this age, but who would have been more worthy of honour in his literary character, had he, like his kinsman Ælfred, condescended to write in his native tongue, instead of clothing a most meagre record in most inflated Latin. As and Eal-
dorman for Ælfric, his identity and his actions form one of the Ælfric. standing difficulties of this period. An Ælfric, son of Ælfhere of Mercia, had, as we have seen, succeeded his father in the government of that country, and had been banished³ five years before. An Ealdorman Ælfric died

¹ See the preamble to the Peace in Thorpe, i. 284. Cf. Chron. and Fl. Wig. 991.

² See above, p. 290.

³ See above, p. 294. There are two Charters referring to the banishment of one or other of these Ælfrics. One in Thorpe's Diplomatarium, p. 282, attributed to the year 993, granting certain lands to the monastery of Abingdon, says, "Has terrarum portiones Alfric cognomento Puer à quâdam viduâ Eadflæd appellatâ violenter abstraxit, ac deinde quum in ducatu suo contra me et contra omnem gentem meam reus existeret quando ad synodale concilium ad Cyrneceastre universi optimates mei simul in unum convenerunt, et eundem Alfricum majestatis reum de hac patriâ profugum expulerunt." The other charter, of 999 (Cod. Dipl. iii. 312. Chron. Abingdon. i. 373), states much the same of "comes vocitamine Ælfric." This charter is signed by an "Ælfric Dux," probably the one who died at Assandun in 1016. "Alfricus Cyld," that is, of course, "cognomento Puer," is spoken of also in the Ely History (i. 12) as a chief man before Æthelred was King (969-979). The description of the Witenagemót at Cirencester reads very like the banishment in 986.

CHAP. V. fighting for his country twenty-five years later.¹ Very possibly these are three distinct persons; but, as the Ælfric of whom we are now speaking was pardoned after crimes which might seem unpardonable, it may well be that he is the same as the already banished son of Ælfhere.² Having bought a respite for their own districts,³ they next persuaded the King and his Witan to buy a general peace for the whole land.⁴ The terms of the treaty show that, if the invaders were not actually to settle in the land, they were at least not expected to make a speedy departure. They engage to help King Æthelred against any fleet which may come to invade England; neither party is to receive the enemies of the other; and various provisions are made, which would be quite out of place if the Northmen had been expected to sail away at once.⁵

Peace purchased of the Northmen. 991.

¹ Chron. and Fl. Wig. 1016.

² But it should be noticed that Florence in no way implies that the Ælfric of 991 was the same as the banished Ælfric of 986, while he takes great pains to show that the Ælfric of 991 is the same as the traitor of 992 ("Alfricum cuius supra meminimus") and of 1003 ("Alfricus Dux supra memoratus").

³ I do not know where Æthelweard's Ealdormanship lay. If this Ælfric was Ealdorman of the Mercians, it is clear that his government would be directly threatened by an enemy who probably had possession of a large part of East-Anglia and Essex.

⁴ See the Treaty in Thorpe, i. 284. Schmid, 204. This treaty must belong to this year, and, if so, it seems to prove that Olaf Tryggwesson was present, and also that he was not yet either King or catechumen. Had the document belonged to the later dealings with Olaf, he would hardly have been placed alongside with Justin and Guthmund, but some notice would have been taken both of his Christianity and of his royal rank. Compare the different language of the treaties of Ælfred with the first, and of Eadward with the second, Guthrum. Thorpe, i. 152, 166. Schmid (p. li.) supposes, either that the Anlaf here spoken of was another person from Olaf Tryggwesson, or that the name Anlaf is an interpolation in the text. But surely these suppositions are rather violent, when the matter can be explained without recourse to them.

⁵ Provision is made for wergilds, for the reception of merchants, and for various civil contingencies, which clearly imply a long stay. Neither side is to receive the other's thieves, foes, or *Welshmen*. "And þæt naðor ne hý ne we underfon oðres Wealh ne oðres þeof ne oðres gefán." Who were

And the events of the next year clearly show that they CHAP. V.
 did not sail away, and they seem also to imply that the Fleet as-
 peace was broken. For in that year Æthelred and his sembled at
London.
 Witan¹ gathered together a fleet at London, which was 992.
 placed under the command of two Bishops, Æscwig of
 Dorchester and Ælfric² of Ramsbury, and of two lay
 chiefs, Thored the Earl, of whom we have already heard, and
 who was perhaps the King's father-in-law,³ and, unluckily
 for the enterprise, Ælfric the Ealdorman. We have now
 reached the first of that long series of utterly inexplicable
 treasons, which were, in a way as utterly inexplicable, inva-
 riably forgiven by those against whom they were wrought.
 One can understand the wretched policy which buys off an
 enemy, or the sheer cowardice which flies from an enemy.
 Contemptible as both of them are, neither of them implies
 any deliberate treachery or any positive perversion of heart.
 But what human motive could induce an English Ealdor-
 man deliberately to betray his country to the heathen in-
 vaders? Yet so to do now becomes the regular course on
 the part of the royal favourites, a class who form a strange
 contrast to the brave men, chiefs and people alike, whose
 patriotic efforts were so often thwarted by them. Ælfric Treason of
Ælfric.
 now first sent word to the Northmen to beware lest they
 should be surrounded by the English fleet, and then
 actually joined them with his own contingent. The Eng- Naval vic-
tory of the
English.
 lish, among whom the East-Angles and the citizens of
 London were the foremost, pursued and gave battle; the 992.

the *Wealas* of the Northmen? Had the word so completely shared the fate
 of the word *Slave*?

¹ Chron. in anno. "þa gerædde se cyning and ealle his witan." So
 Fl. Wig. "Consilio jussuque Regis Anglorum Ægelredi procerumque
 suorum."

² His name is *Ælfstan* both in the Chronicles and in Florence, through
 some confusion with a predecessor of that name, who died in 981.

³ See above, p. 294. Thored in the Chronicle is *Eorl*, Ælfric is *Ealdor-
 man*. This distinction clearly marks out Thored as of Danish extraction, or
 as holding a government within the Danish part of England.

CHAP. V.

Ælfgar
blinded.
993.

Import-
ance of
London,
military
and com-
mercial.

Compari-
son with
Paris.

Danes were defeated with great slaughter; the traitor's ship was taken with all its contents, but he himself narrowly escaped. Æthelred took a base and cowardly revenge by blinding Ælfgar the son of Ælfric, against whom there is nothing whatever to show that he had any share in his father's crime. Yet, strange to say, within a few years Ælfric himself was again in favour, and again in a position to command and to betray English armies.

The storm was thus turned away from London. The importance of that great city was daily growing throughout these times. We cannot as yet call it the capital of the Kingdom; the very amount of its internal independence would make such a title inapplicable; but its geographical position made it one of the chief bulwarks of the land, and in no part of the realm do we find the inhabitants outdoing the patriotism and courage of its valiant citizens. London, at this time, fills much the same place in England which Paris filled in Northern Gaul a century earlier. The two cities, in their several lands, were the two great fortresses, placed on the two great rivers of the country, the special objects of attack on the part of the invaders and the special defence of the country against them. Each was, as it were, marked out by great public services to become the capital of the whole Kingdom. But Paris became so only because its local Count gradually grew into a national King; London, amidst all changes within and without, has always preserved more or less of her ancient character as a free city. Paris was merely a military bulwark, the dwelling-place of a ducal or royal sovereign; London, no less important as a military post, had also a greatness which rested on a surer foundation. London, like a few other great cities, is one of the ties which connect our Teutonic England with the Celtic and Roman Britain of earlier times. Her British name still remains unchanged by the

Teutonic conquerors. Before our first introduction to London as an English city, she had cast away her Roman and imperial title; she was no longer Augusta;¹ she had again assumed her ancient name, and through all changes she had adhered to her ancient character. The commercial fame of London dates from the early days of Roman dominion.² The English Conquest may have caused a temporary interruption, but it was only temporary. As early as the days of Æthelberht the commerce of London was again renowned.³ Ælfred had rescued the city from the Dane; he had built a citadel for her defence,⁴ the germ of that Tower which was to be first the dwelling-place of Kings, and then the scene of the martyrdom of their victims. Among the Laws of Æthelstan none are more remarkable than those which deal with the internal affairs of London and with the regulation of her earliest commercial corporations.⁵ During the reign of Æthelred the merchant city was again the object of special and favourable legislation.⁶ Her Institutes speak of a commerce spread over all the lands which bordered on the Western Ocean. Flemings and Frenchmen, men of Ponthieu, of Brabant, and of Lüttich, filled her markets with their wares and enriched the civic coffers with their tolls. Thither too came the men of Rouen, whose descendants were, at no distant day, to form a considerable element among her own citizens. And, worthy and favoured above all, came the seafaring men of the old Saxon brother-land, the

Commerce
of London;

Privileges
enjoyed by
the "Men

¹ Amm. Marc. xxvii. 8. "Lundinium vetus oppidum, quod Augustam posteritas appellavit." xxviii. 3. "Ab Augustâ profectus, quam veteres appellavere Lundinium." The popular name of London survived the official name of Augusta, just as Sikyôn survived Dêmétrias, as Mantinea survived Antigoneia, as Jerusalem survived Ælia Capitolina.

² Tac. Ann. xiv. 33.

³ Bæda, Eccl. Hist. ii. 3.

⁴ Chron. 986. On the probability that the present Tower occupies the site of a fortress of Ælfred's, see Mr. Earle's note, p. 310.

⁵ Thorpe, Laws and Inst. i. 228. Kemble, Saxons in England, ii. 521.

⁶ Instituta Londoniæ, Thorpe, i. 300.

CHAP. V. pioneers of the mighty Hansa of the North, who were, in
of the days to come, to knit together London and Novgorod in
Emperor." one bond of commerce, and to dictate laws and distribute
crowns among the nations by whom London was now
threatened. The demand for toll and tribute fell lightly
on those whom English legislation distinguished as the
Men of the Emperor.¹ The manifest advantages of their
trade, perhaps some feeling or memory of their common
blood and speech, procured privileges for them to which
the Gaul and the Norman had no claim, privileges which
were not extended to the kindred Fleming, vassal as he
was of the West-Frankish King, or to the Lorrainer, still
a vassal of Cæsar, but already exposed to the contagion of
foreign influence and language. The chief seat of their
enterprise was indeed as yet not open to them, and the
chief seat of their dominion was as yet not in being.
Queenly Lübeck had not yet begun to cover her peninsula
with her stately spires, her soaring gateways, the rich and
varied dwellings of her merchant-princes, and the proud
pile of that Council-House which was to form the centre
of the commerce and policy of Northern Europe. The
Baltic, one day to be an Hanseatic Lake, was still sur-
rounded throughout its coasts by savage or piratical tribes
to whom all Christendom alike was hostile. But, if the
Trave was not yet reached, the Elbe and the Weser were
already occupied. The fame of Hamburg and of Bremen
was as yet ecclesiastical rather than commercial; still we
may well believe that, among the continental brethren
whom London welcomed, there were some who had ven-
tured forth from their infant havens. And the Rhine at

¹ Thorpe, i. 300. Lappenberg, *Gesch. des hansischen Stablhofes*, p. 5. The great privilege of the "*homines Imperatoris, qui veniebant in navibus suis*," seems to have been that they were, with certain exceptions, allowed to buy and sell on board their own ships, which doubtless exempted them from certain tolls to which others were liable.

least was still open; the ancient Colony of Agrippina was already a chief mart of Teutonic commerce; as early as the days of Charles and Offa, commerce between England and the Empire was a matter of special interest on both sides;¹ and now, in the days of Æthelred, the Men of the Emperor, alone among the natives of foreign lands, were emphatically spoken of as "worthy of good laws, even as we ourselves."²

The great merchant city was thus saved, mainly, as we shall often find it in these wars, by the valour of her own citizens. The Northmen, baffled in their attack on London, turned their course northward; they stormed King Ida's fortress of Bamborough, the earliest seat of Northumbrian royalty; they then turned back to the mouth of the Humber, and ravaged the country on both sides of that river. The men of Lindesey and Deira were no less ready to defend their country than the men of London and East-Anglia; but they had less worthy leaders. Just as a battle was beginning, the English commanders set the example of flight. Their names were Fræna, Frithegist, and Godwine, two of them at least old servants of Eadgar's, and it is distinctly implied that the cause of their cowardice and treachery was that they were themselves of Danish descent, and that they therefore sympathized with the invaders rather than with those whom it was their duty to defend.³

¹ See W. Malm. i. 93. Cf. above, p. 39.

² Thorpe, i. 300. "Homines Imperatoris, qui veniebant in navibus suis, bonorum legum digni tenebantur, sicut et nos."

³ The Chronicles say simply, "þa onstealdon þa heretogan sœrest þone fleam þæt wæs Fræna and Godwine and Friðegist." Florence expands somewhat; "Duces exercitus, Frana videlicet, Frithogist, et Godwinus, quia ex paterno genere Danici fuerunt, suis insidiantes, auctores fugæ primitus exstiterunt." The words "ex paterno genere" would imply that the earlier Danish settlers, like the followers of Cnut and of William afterwards, often took English wives. Also Florence translates "heretogan" by "duces exercitus," lest "heretogan" should be taken to imply the permanent rank of Ealdorman. Neither Fræna nor Frithegist ever held that rank. They sign charters in abundance, from the days of Eadgar onwards, but never with

CHAP. V.

Ravages in
the North
of England.
993.

Treason
of Fræna,
Frithegist,
and God-
wine.

CHAP. V.
Affairs of
Wales.

Border
warfare
with the
Welsh.

Scandina-
vian incur-
sions in
Wales.

988.

Our narrative is thus far, on the whole, straightforward and intelligible, but two difficult questions now present themselves. Were these Scandinavian invasions accompanied by any efforts on the part of the Celtic inhabitants of Britain to shake off the English supremacy? Was Æthelred, while thus attacked by foreign invaders, himself engaged in foreign disputes and wars, perhaps in actual invasion of a foreign country? As far as the Welsh are concerned, it would be alike impossible and unprofitable to try to trace out all the details of the border warfare which was constantly going on along the Mercian frontier. The English Chronicles scarcely ever condescend to speak of the vicissitudes of these endless skirmishes, while the Welsh Chronicles are full of them. They tell us of a good many incursions of the "Saxons," but they are far fuller of the ravages of the "Black Pagans," who were probably much oftener Norsemen from Ireland and the Western Islands than actual Danes from Denmark. And it is small honour to the Emperor of all Britain that his plan of buying off the heathen ravagers had perhaps been forestalled by a vassal prince of Wales.¹ This prince, Meredydd, son of Owen, seems to have spread his dominion over the greater part of the modern Principality,² and in

any higher rank than that of "Minister" or "Miles." Fræna signs a great many charters long after this. In 995 he signs two of Æscwig, Bishop of Dorchester (Cod. Dipl. iii. 286, 288), which may imply that he belonged to Lindesey and not to Deira. Of Godwine we may suspect that he also was of Lindesey, that he reformed, and obtained the rank of Ealdorman. Godwine, Ealdorman of Lindesey, died at Assandun in 1016, is most likely the man here spoken of; but Godwine is so common a name that it is impossible to say to whom all the signatures of "Godwine minister" belong. Sometimes two Godwines sign without further distinction.

¹ So it stands in the English version of the Brut y Tywysogion, in anno; "And Maredudd, son of Owain, paid to the Black Pagans a tribute of one penny for each person." But in the Annales Cambriæ the transaction takes the milder form of a redemption of captives; "Maredut redemit captivos a gentilibus nigris, nummo pro unoquoque dato."

² His own dominions are described (Brut, 991) as Dyfed, Ceredigion,

the year of the Battle of Maldon we distinctly find him, not only at war with the English, but in league with the Northmen. A Prince of Gwent and Morganwg,¹ in company with an English commander whose name appears to have been Æthelsige, ravaged the Kingdom of Meredydd as far as Saint David's, in return for which Meredydd, with an army of heathen mercenaries,² ravaged Morganwg, the dominions of the Welsh ally of England. One would be more anxious to know what was the position of Scotland at this time. The reception of Swend by Kenneth, if it be historical, might seem to point to an unfriendly feeling towards England; but we have no notices of Scottish affairs till some years later.

CHAP. V.

War with Meredydd. 991.

A more important question still now presents itself. As far as we can gather from most imperfect and contradictory accounts, it appears that it was during these years that the first direct intercourse between England and Normandy took place, and that that intercourse was of an unfriendly, if not a directly hostile, kind.³ The quarrel seems to have arisen from the hospitable reception which was given in the Norman ports to the piratical fleets which were engaged in the plunder of England. The old connexion with Denmark, and the good services which had been rendered by King Harold, were not forgotten

Æthelred's relations with Normandy.

Disputes arising from the shelter given in Normandy to Danish vessels.

Gower, and Cydweli, answering to the modern counties of Pembroke, Cardigan, Caermarthen, and part of Glamorgan. In 985 he conquered Mona or Anglesey, Merioneth, and Gwynedd generally.

¹ He is called Owen, Guyn, and Etwin, the last a very unlikely name. His English ally appears in the Brut as "Eclis the Great, a Saxon prince from the seas of the south." The Annals call him Edelisi, clearly Æthelsige, but he can hardly be the East-Anglian Thegn, the son of Æthelstan.

² Brut y Tywysogion, 991. "Maredudd hired the Pagans willing to join him."

³ The difficulties connected with the relations between Æthelred and Normandy are so great that I reserve their discussion for an Appendix, and simply give in the text what seems to me the most probable version.

CHAP. V. in Normandy. The kind reception thus due to the Danes in general may have extended itself even to those who were in fact Harold's rebellious subjects, warring against the champion of the faith common to Normandy and England. The Norman ports lay most conveniently open for the sale of the plunder of Wessex; it is even possible that some of the inhabitants of those parts of Normandy where the old Danish spirit still lingered may have joined their heathen kinsmen in incursions on the opposite coast.¹

988. Considering the chronology, it seems most likely that the invasion of Somersetshire which took place in the year of Dunstan's death was aided and abetted by Richard's subjects in one or other of these ways. A dispute thus arose between Æthelred and the Duke; whether it led to open war is uncertain. At any rate it assumed importance enough to call for the intervention of the common Father of Christendom. The reigning Pope, John the Fifteenth, stepped in to reconcile two Christian Princes who were weakening one another in the presence of threatening, if not triumphant, heathendom. Leo, Bishop of Trier, was sent by the Pontiff to the court of Æthelred on a message of peace. He thence went to Duke Richard at Rouen, accompanied by an English embassy, consisting of Æthelsige, Bishop of Sherborne, and two Thegns named Leofstan and Æthelnoth, who are no otherwise distinguished, but whose names are attached to many of the charters of the time. Peace was concluded on the terms that neither party should receive the enemies of the other, nor the subjects of either, unless provided with passports from their own sovereign.²

Reconciliation
brought
about by
Pope John
the Fifteenth.
991.

¹ This is the conjecture of Lappenberg, ii. 153, Eng. Tr.

² Will. Malm. ii. 166. "Et de hominibus Regis vel inimicis suis nullum Ricardus recipiat, neque Rex de suis, sine sigillo eorum." *Sigillum* does not necessarily imply a seal in the later sense; a signature of any kind is enough.

There can be no doubt that in these transactions we may discern the germs of much that came to pass in later years. The first recorded intercourse between the courts of Rouen and Winchester paved the way for that chain of events which was at last to enthrone a descendant of Richard in the royal city of Æthelred. Each country now began to feel the importance of the other, whether as a friend or as an enemy. As we go on in the reign of Æthelred, we shall find intercourse of all kinds with Normandy growing more frequent at every step. And, for the first and the last time in the common history of the two countries, the Roman Bishop appears in his proper character of a common peacemaker and father. The next Pontiff who mingles in a strife between a King of the English and a Duke of the Normans appears in quite another light.

CHAP. V.
Increasing
connexion
between
England
and Nor-
mandy
from this
time.

§ 3. *From the first dispute with Normandy to the Massacre of Saint Brice. 991-1002.*

We must now again come back to the consecutive narrative of the Danish wars. In the year after the sack of Bamborough and the ignominious flight of the Thengs of Lindesey, the invasions began again on a more terrible scale. They were no longer the plundering expeditions of private Vikings, or of the sons of Kings spending their hot youth in this wild warfare against their neighbours. They were no longer the expeditions of adventurous chieftains and their followers seeking to better their fortunes by winning themselves new homes at the point of the sword. The two mightiest powers of the North were now joined together in a momentary league to compass the utter subjugation of England. Instead of the sea-rovers of a few years back, the invaders are now two powerful Kings with royal fleets and armies at their disposal. Olaf, King of

Great com-
bined ex-
pedition of
Olaf and
Swend.
994.

CHAP. V. the Norwegians, and Swend, King of the Danes, joined their forces in a greater expedition than any that Brihtnoth had ever met with steel or Æthelred with gold. The pretext for war on the part of Olaf is not apparent; Swend gave out that he came to revenge the inhospitable treatment which he had received from the King of the English in the days of his adversity.¹ At the head of a fleet of ninety-four ships, the two Kings of the North sailed up the Thames and laid siege to London, the first, but not the last, siege which the great City was to undergo in this fearful warfare. For the first, but not for the last time, the valiant burghers, who had already learned to grapple with the Dane on his own element, beat back the invaders from their walls. The fire of twelve years back had doubtless been a mere passing calamity, and it could have done little to lessen the strength of the Roman rampart and of the Tower of Ælfred. But it was not only to such worldly bulwarks that the defenders of London trusted; on that day the Mother of God, of her mild-heartedness, rescued the Christian city from its foes.² An assault on the wall, coupled with an attempt to burn the town, was defeated with great slaughter of the besiegers, and the two Kings sailed away the same day in wrath and sorrow.³ Here was another triumph of English valour; but, as ever in this reign, valour and counsel were local; cowardice and utter incapacity presided at head-quarters. Under Ælfred or Æthelstan, such a check as the invaders had met with before London would have been followed up by some crushing victory, and the slain of Maldon would have been avenged in the glories of another

Attack on
London
defeated
by the
citizens.
994.

¹ See above, p. 290.

² Chron. in anno. "Ac seo halige Godes modor on þam dæge hire mild-heortnesse þære burhware gecyðde, and hi ahredde wið heora feondum." A good deal of the simple earnestness of the English evaporates in Florence's Latin, "Dei suæque genetricis Mariæ iuvamine."

³ Flor. Wig. "Furore simul et tristitiâ exasperati."

Brunanburh. Under the wretched Æthelred the very valour of the Londoners only led to the more fearful desolation of other parts of the Kingdom. The enemy were allowed to ravage the coast at pleasure; and at last, meeting with no resistance, they seized on horses, and rode through the eastern and southern shires, pillaging, burning, murdering, without regard to age or sex.¹ These horrors were carried on without interruption throughout the old Kingdoms of Essex, Kent, and Sussex; at last the invaders crossed the West-Saxon frontier, and by their presence in Hampshire threatened the royal city and the royal person. London and Essex might have been forgotten, but it was now clearly time to do something. But what was to be done? Æthelred and his Witan could think of nothing but their old wretched expedient. The invaders were again bought off; they were allowed to winter at Southampton; a special tax was levied on Wessex to supply the crews with food and pay, and a general tax was levied on all England to raise the sum of sixteen thousand pounds as a payment to the two Kings.² For once this policy, favoured by special circumstances, was partly successful. The union of Denmark and Norway was broken, and one of the invading Kings was won over to lasting peace and neutrality. Both the leaders of the heathen fleet were baptized men. Swend indeed, the godson of Cæsar, had denied his faith and had waged a parricidal war on behalf of the old heathendom. But

CHAP. V.

Ravages in the South-East of England.

Æthelred again buys peace.

Embassy of Ælfheah and Æthelward to Olaf.

¹ It would, I imagine, be very hard to find out the exact point in Olaf Tryggvesson's life when, according to his Saga (c. xiii.), he made expeditions in Britain, Ireland, and Scotland, attacking the heathen and keeping peace with the Christians. It would be hardly more difficult to identify the widow of an English Ealdorman and daughter of an Irish King, whom Olaf marries in the next chapter. See above, p. 395.

² I conceive this to be the distinction intended by Florence, when he says "de totâ West-Saxonia *stipendium* dabatur ['and hi mon þær *fedde geond eall Westseaxena rice*, say the Chronicles]; de totâ vero Angliâ *tributum*, quod erat xvi. millia librarum, dependebatur."

CHAP. V. the baptism of Olaf was more recent and more voluntary. His later history sets him before us as a zealous Christian, who evangelized his Kingdom at the point of the sword, and who, in the name of the religion of mercy, repaid upon the heathen all that Christian confessors and martyrs had suffered at their hands. A faith which shows itself in such works as these may indeed be far removed from the true spirit of the Gospel; but such fiery zeal at least implies the firmest belief in the dogmas which are thus to be forced upon all men at all hazards. We can then well understand that Olaf, already a Christian, might easily be led to repent of the horrors which he was inflicting on a Christian land, whose sovereign and people had never wronged him. He willingly listened to an English embassy which came to win him over more completely to the side of his brethren in the faith. One of the ambassadors sent was Ælfheah, then the Bishop of the diocese in which Olaf was wintering, a Prelate who was, some years later, to ascend the metropolitan throne and to win the crown of martyrdom at the hands of the still heathen Danes. His colleague was the literary Ealdorman, Patricius Consul Fabius Quæstor Ethelwerdus, again more vigorous in negotiation than in warfare. The Norwegian King exchanged hostages with Æthelred; he was led "with mickle worship" to the court at Andover; he was received with every honour and enriched with royal gifts. Already baptized, he received the rite of confirmation¹ from Bishop Ælfheah, and was adopted by Æthelred as his son. The royal neophyte promised never again to

Olaf's confirmation and adoption.

¹ The confirmation of Olaf implies his previous baptism, and thereby remarkably confirms that part of the legend. But Adam of Bremen (ii. 34) has two quite different accounts, according to one of which Olaf learned Christianity in England for the first time, while, according to the other, he was converted in Norway by English missionaries. The one point in which all versions agree is to connect his conversion with England in some shape or other.

invade England; and, as soon as summer appeared, he sailed away to his own country, and faithfully kept his promise. The later days of this prince, who fills so large a space both in the history and in the romance of his country, were spent in the forcible introduction of Christianity into his own Kingdom, and in a war with his momentary ally of Denmark, in a sea-fight against whom he at last perished.

CHAP. V.

He departs
for Nor-
way.

995.

His later
days and
death.
1000.

One enemy was thus changed, if not into a friend, at least into a neutral; and the other, perhaps weakened by the conversion of his ally, seems to have remained comparatively inactive for several years. Of Swend himself personally we hear nothing in English history for nine years, and when he did personally appear again, he had a terrible reason for so appearing. The Danish fleet however remained on the English coast, but for a while we hear of no further ravages. It would seem however that the interval was partly employed in attacks both on the vassals and on the continental kinsmen of England. In the year of Olaf's departure Swend is said to have ravaged the Isle of Man,¹ and there is no doubt that these years were a time in which both Danes and Swedes were busily employed in attacks on the land of the continental Saxons.² In England this short respite was largely devoted to the work of legislation, and to the carrying on of the ordinary business of government. Meetings of the Witan were frequent. More than one such took place during the year of Olaf's departure,³ a

Inaction
of Swend.
994-1003.Meetings
of the
Witen-
gemót.
995.

¹ Ann. Camb. Brut y Tywysogion, 994.

² See Thietmar, iv. 16. Adam Brem. ii. 29.

³ The Charters of this year in the Codex Diplomaticus (iii. 284, 286, and 288), one of King Æthelred and two of Æscwig, Bishop of Dorchester, belong to a meeting before the death of Sigeric, by whom they were signed. Those of the same year at pp. 281 and 290, which Ælfric signs as Archbishop elect, must belong to a later meeting, probably that at which he was elected. He was consecrated next year (Chron. and Fl. Wig.). Had he held the Bishoprick of Ramsbury without consecration?

THE DANISH CONQUEST OF ENGLAND.

year of some importance in ecclesiastical history. Arch-
 bishop Sigeric died, and the vacant office was given, by
 the election of the Witan assembled at Amesbury in
 Wiltshire,¹ to the Bishop of the Diocese in which they
 were met, Ælfric of Ramsbury, a prelate whose name
 is still remembered as the author of various contribu-
 tions to our early theological literature. In the same
 year one of the greatest and most famous of English
 bishopricks found its permanent resting-place. The
 bishoprick of Bernicia or Northern Northumberland, one
 originally planted by Scottish missionaries, had its first
 seat in the Holy Island of Lindisfarne, where, for a short
 time during the later part of the seventh century, the
 monastic virtues of its sixth Bishop Saint Cuthberht.² He became the
 patron of the See, and his body was looked upon as its
 choicest possession. In the great Danish invasion of
 the ninth century, the Bishop and his monks fled from
 their island, and carried the body of his saint hither and
 thither, till it found a resting-place at Eboracaster or
 Chester-le-Street.³ Here the Bishopric remained for
 more than a century, till, in the year which we have
 now reached, Ealdhun, the reigning Prelate, removed it
 hence more to that noble site which his successors have
 retained ever since. This translation of his shopricks from
 the place of that general removal of his shopricks from
 carried out systematically soon after the Norman Conquest.

¹ So the Chronicles, but only in the late Canterbury manuscript (Cott.
 Comit. A. viii.). This fact however is probably authentic; but what can
 be made of the story of Ælfric driving out the seculars from Christ Church,
 where Sigeric had already introduced monks? See above, p. 304.
² See Bæda, Eccl. Hist. iv. 27, and the prose and verse lives of Saint
 Cuthberht in his Opera Historica Minora, pp. 3, 49. Also Sim. Dun.,
 Eccl. Dun. lib. ii. c. 6, et seqq. (X Scriptt. 13.)
³ Flor. Wig. 995.

CHAP. V. to Durham by Ealdhun is the turning-point in the history of that great Bishoprick. And it is something more; it is deserving of notice in the general history of England as laying the foundation of a state of things which in England remained exceptional, but which, had it gained a wider field, would have made a lasting change in the condition of the country. The spiritual Palatine of Durham and the temporal Palatine of Chester stood alone in the possession of their extraordinary franchises. The unity of the Kingdom was therefore not seriously endangered by the existence of these isolated principalities, especially as the temporal Palatinate so early became an appanage of the heir to the Crown. But had all Bishopricks possessed the same rights as Durham, had all Earldoms possessed the same rights as Chester, England could never have remained a consolidated monarchy. It must have fallen in pieces in exactly the same way that the Empire did, and from essentially the same cause.

Witena-
gemót at
Celchyth,
[996];
at Calne
and Want-
age,
[997].

Another meeting of the Witan was held the next year at Celchyth,¹ and a more important one the year after at Calne, which, after a few days, transferred its sittings to Wantage.² Here, besides the usual business of confirming the King's grants of lands or privileges to churches or to private men, a code of laws was drawn up. At an earlier council, held at Woodstock in an uncertain year, a code had been published,³ designed mainly for the purely English portions of the Kingdom; the labours of the Witan

¹ Cod. Dipl. iii. 299.

² Ib. iii. 302. "Collecta haud minima sapientum multitudine in aula villæ regiae quæ nuncupative à populis et [æt ?] Calnæ vocitatur. Ac sic paucis interpositis ymeris [*himeris*, *ἡμέραις*] rursus advocata omnis exercitus, caterva pontificum, abbatum, ducum, optimatum nobiliumque quamplurimorum ad villam quæ ab indigenis Wanetincg agnominatur," &c. &c. The whole passage is remarkable and valuable.

³ Thorpe, i. 280. Schmid, 198. The Wantage laws are said specially to be "æfter Engla lage."

CHAP. V. in protecting the citizens of Rochester. The next year the Danes sailed up the Thames and Medway, and besieged the town. The men of Kent went forth to battle, but, after a hard struggle, they were defeated, and the Danes horsed themselves and ravaged the whole western part of the shire. The Wise Men then met again, this time to devise means for carrying on the war. They voted, and actually got together, a fleet and army; but nothing came of it. Both in this year and in the former one everything went wrong. Armies were often gathered together; but time was wasted in all manner of delays, and meanwhile the soldiers who were assembled did nearly as much damage as the enemy. If things ever got on so far that they met the enemy in battle, either ill luck or treachery always gave the victory to the heathen. And when the ships were gathered together, there was only delay from day to day; the crews were harassed grievously; when things should have been forward, they were only the more backward; they let the enemy's army ever increase; and ever they went away from the sea, and the enemy followed them; and in the end there was nothing for either the land-force or the sea-force, but grieving of the folk and spending of money and emboldening of their foes.¹

The Witen-
agemót
collects a
fleet and
army.

Their in-
efficiency,
and general
misery of
the coun-
try.

Causes of
the ineffi-
cient resist-
ance to the
Danes.

Such is the picture of the times given us by our best authorities. And it is clear that, to bring about such a state of things, there must have been causes which lay deeper than the mere incapacity or carelessness of Æthelred or than the treachery of a few chiefs of Danish descent.² On the other hand, it is perfectly clear that there was no

¹ See the Chronicles (followed by Florence) for the years 998 and 999. I have worked the two descriptions together.

² For the suggestion of the general line of thought in this paragraph I am indebted to Lappenberg, ii. 161.

lack of zeal or courage on the part of the people in any part of the country where the invaders landed. This is shown by the valiant resistance which they always met with whenever local power was in worthy hands. It is not unlikely that the forms of the English constitution of that day were partly in fault. The power of resistance was weakened—perhaps by the very amount of freedom, general and local, which the English already enjoyed—certainly by the still very imperfect nature of the union which existed between the different parts of the Kingdom. We have, in our own times, often heard the complaint that a constitutional government is less able than a despotism to carry on a war with vigour. This charge is refuted, if by nothing else, by the result of the great civil war in America. But the experiences of that civil war, and many experiences of our own, combine to show that a free country has greater difficulty than a despotism in the mere setting about a war. No free state could expect to rival the readiness, vigour, and audacity with which Prussia opened the wonderful campaign which has just been brought to a close. The very institutions which secure national, local, and personal freedom, sometimes form a temporary, though most certainly only a temporary, hindrance, especially in the case of civil war or of sudden invasion. The old free institutions of England threw difficulties in the way of a national resistance, difficulties which the genius of Ælfred, his son, or his grandson, would have overcome, but which were utterly overwhelming to Æthelred and his advisers. It is also probable that, in a country which was still so imperfectly united, one part of the Kingdom did not greatly care for the misfortunes of another. The devastation of Kent and Wessex would not cause any very deep sorrow or alarm to the Danish people of Northumberland. Local resistance was always possible. A valiant Ealdorman might, with comparative ease, get together his own per-

CHAP. V.

General
question of
the action
of consti-
tutional
states.

1861-5.

1866.

Imperfect
union of
the parts
of the
Kingdom.

CHAP. V. sonal following and the able-bodied men of his shire. But even this process took time. While the English were arming, the Danes were plundering; and, if a battle took place, the Danish force, which a general national movement would have crushed at once, commonly proved too strong for the array of any one district. A general national resistance was of course still more distinctly a work of time. The King had no standing army; he could demand the services of his military followers, but even they could not be assembled in a moment; and no real national step could be taken, no national army or fleet could be brought together, no money could be gathered or expended, without the consent of the Witan. And, when the Witan met, we can well understand that personal jealousies, and local jealousies even more, to say nothing of the causes which always affect all assemblies, would often hinder, or at least delay, the adoption of any vigorous resolution. And when the Witan had passed their vote, they had to go back to their shires and hundreds, to announce the determinations of the National Council,¹ and to gather together the forces of their several districts. One shire would be ready perhaps months before another, while all the while there was the most pressing need for immediate action. Such an army would become dispirited and demoralized before it had really come together. The difficulty of subsistence, when it was not likely that regular pay could be given, would, in such a case, often drive the defenders of the country to become almost as destructive as its invaders. Even when there was no actual treason or cowardice, these things would be difficulties in the way of the greatest of princes; under such a prince as Æthelred they were found to be simply unsurmountable. Ælfred had carried England through dangers as great as those which threatened her now; but it needed an Ælfred to do such a work.

Difficulties
caused by
English
constitu-
tional
forms.

Effect of
the per-
sonal cha-
racter of
King.

¹ See above, p. 111.

Under Æthelred nothing was done; or, more truly, CHAP. V. throughout his whole reign, he left undone those things which he ought to have done, and he did those things which he ought not to have done.

For the fault of Æthelred, after all, was not mere weakness.¹ The Unready King showed occasional glimpses of vigour which might for a moment remind men that he came of the same stock as Eadward the Unconquered and as Æthelstan the Glorious. But it was a vigour which came only by fits and starts, which acted only at unfitting times and for unfitting objects. As far as we can judge by his actions, his character was not one of mere abject incapacity like Edward of Caernarvon. He was rather like Richard of Bourdeaux, idle, careless, governed by worthless favourites, but showing ever and anon, though always in the wrong place, signs of a strong will and a capacity for vigorous action. So now it was at this memorable crisis of his Kingdom. He had at last got together a fleet and army, and, having got it together, he would do something with it. But the Danes were gone; they had got together their plunder, and had sailed away, as before, to sell it in the Norman ports.² Æthelred took advantage of

Character of Æthelred; vigorous always in the wrong place.
The Danes sail to Normandy. 1000.

¹ Compare on this head a remarkable passage of William of Malmesbury, ii. 165. "Verumtamen multa mihi cogitanti mirum videtur cur homo, ut a majoribus accepimus, neque multum fatuus, neque nimis ignavus, in tam tristi pallore tot calamitatum vitam consumpserit. Cujus rei causam si quis me interroget, non facile respondeam; nisi ducum defectionem, ex superbis Regis prodeuntem." This hardly goes to the root of the matter; but William's perplexity clearly shows that the traditional character of Æthelred did not paint him as a mere idiot, but as a man with the capacity, though only the bare capacity, for better things. See also Palgrave's *Hist. of England and Normandy*, iii. 103.

² Such I understand to be the object of the departure of the Danish fleet. The *Chronicles* and *Florence* are quite colourless. "Se unfrið flota was ðæs sumeres gewend to Ricardes rice." "Danorum classis præfata hoc anno Nortmanniam petit." But Roger of Wendover (i. 434) inserts

CHAP. V. their absence to plunge into a needless war with one
 Æthelred of his own vassals. He does not seem ever to have
 ravages thought of going forth personally to battle against the
 Cumber- Danes; but the Emperor of Britain could trust no one
 land in but himself to lead an army against the under-King-
 person, and dom of Cumberland. He ravaged nearly the whole of
 his fleet the principality by land, and would have ravaged it by
 ravages sea also, only the fleet which set out from Chester was
 Man. hindered by contrary winds from meeting him at the
 1000. appointed spot.¹ It did however reach Man, and harried
 the island. The cause of all this untimely activity is
 not stated by our best English authorities. Æthelred
 no doubt fancied that he was imitating his predecessors;
 still there must have been some pretence of provocation.
 Man however, at any rate, which had been ravaged by
 Swend only a few years before,² must have been singu-
 larly unlucky if it contrived thus to provoke the wrath
 of both the contending Kings. Nor is it at all clear
 why Malcolm was attacked in his under-Kingdom of
 Cumberland. A Scottish writer³ tells us that Æthelred
 had called on Malcolm to contribute to some of the
 payments made to the Danes, probably to the great
 sum paid to Olaf and Swend six years before. In short
 he wished to make the dependent Kingdom of Cum-
 berland liable, like an English shire, to the impost of

Malcolm's
 refusal to
 pay Dane-
 geld.

the qualification "hostiliter," which is followed by Lappenberg (429. Eng. Tr. ii. 161). On this whole matter see the Appendix.

¹ So I understand the account in the Chronicles and in Florence. The words "circumnavigatâ septentrionali Brytanniâ" again (see above, pp. 48, 323) mean only that they sailed round North Wales. Mr. Thorpe, in translating Lappenberg (ii. 162), carries them "round the north of the island;" but I cannot find this in the German text (p. 430). But the accounts in the Chronicles and in Florence do not seem to mean exactly the same thing. Florence seems to speak of the earlier and the Chronicles of the later part of their voyage.

² See above, p. 319. But Lappenberg takes Monege to mean Anglesey.

³ Fordun, iv. 35; ap. Gale, 681.

Danegeld. Malcolm, we are told, answered with proper spirit. If King Æthelred went forth to battle, he was ready, as in duty bound, to follow his over-lord with his own forces; but he had never covenanted to pay money, and no money would he pay. The authority for this story is not of the first order; but it falls in so exactly with the relations between the two princes that it has internal probability in its favour. Malcolm was not an English Ealdorman, ruling an integral part of the English realm; he was a vassal prince reigning over a dependent Kingdom, a portion of the English Empire, but which had never been under the direct rule of the English Crown. That Kingdom Malcolm held on the terms on which it had been originally granted to his predecessor, those of military service by land and sea.¹ A money tribute had indeed been levied on some of the Welsh princes; but military service was clearly the only contribution which a King of Cumberland owed to the Emperor of Britain. But Æthelred was enraged at his refusal, which, he alleged, could proceed from nothing but good will to the enemy.² He accordingly ravaged the country, but afterwards concluded peace with Malcolm.³ If this story be correct, Malcolm was fully justified in his refusal, and the conduct of Æthelred was a gross breach of the mutual duty of lord and vassal.⁴

¹ Chron. A. 945. See above, p. 64.

² Fordun, u. s. "*Hæc causâ quidem, et sicut Rex in irâ motus asseruit, eo quod Regulus contra sacramentum sibi debitum Danis favebat.*"

³ Ib. "*Postea tamen concordæ per omnia statim effectâ, pace firmâ de cætero convenerunt.*"

⁴ Henry of Huntingdon (M.H.B. 750 A) gives a wholly different account. He makes no mention of Malcolm and makes Cumberland in possession of the Danes. "*Exinde Rex Edelred ivit in Cumberland cum exercitu gravissimo, ubi maxima mansio Dacorum erat: vicitque Dacos bello maximo, totamque fere Cumberland prædando vastavit.*" But Malcolm was certainly reigning in Cumberland, and, if any Danes were there, they must

CHAP. V.

Second
quarrel
with Nor-
mandy.
1000.

[996.]

Æthelred's
invasion
of Nor-
mandy, as
described
by Norman
writers.

Defeat of
the Eng-
lish.

It seems also probable that this untimely activity on the part of Æthelred led him also to match himself against an enemy of a very different kind from the vassal King of Cumberland. As far as probable conjecture can guide us through mazes where difficulties and contradictions meet us at every step, it was during this burst of misapplied energy that Æthelred became again involved in a dispute, most likely in an open war, with the Duke of the Normans.¹ Richard the Fearless, his former antagonist, was now dead, and the reigning prince was his son Richard the Second, surnamed the Good. Of the transactions between the two countries we have no account from any English authority, and the version which we find in the Norman writers, though doubtless containing some germs of truth, is evidently exaggerated in detail. According to them Æthelred sent a fleet into Normandy, with orders to burn and destroy throughout the land, and to spare nothing except the Mount of Saint Michael with its revered sanctuary, one of the great foundations of Richard the Fearless. As for the reigning Duke, he was to be taken prisoner, and brought into the presence of his conqueror with his hands tied behind his back. The English fleet crossed the Channel, landed in the peninsula of Coutances, and began to carry out the royal orders. But Nigel, the valiant Viscount of the district, gathered the men of the country, and smote the invaders with such a slaughter that, of those who actually landed, one man only escaped to the ships. The fleet sailed home with the news of its discomfiture. Æthelred is pictured as waiting for the triumphant return of his fleet with the news of the

have been there by his consent, voluntary or extorted. It is of course open to any one to put the two versions together, that is, to accept the angry inferences of King Æthelred in a stronger form.

¹ See Appendix E.

conquest of Normandy. His first inquiry is for the CHAP. V.
 captive Duke. But, instead of seeing Richard with his
 hands tied behind him, he only hears that his men have
 not so much as seen the Duke, that the men of one
 county had been enough to destroy all their host, that
 the very women had joined in the strife, striking down
 the choicest warriors of England with the staves on which
 they bore their water-pots. Now these details are of
 course pure romance; but the existence of such a story
 seems to show that some hostilities really did take place.

Æthelred's fleet may have pursued the Danish fleet when Probable
 explanation
 of the
 story.
 it sailed to Normandy, and, in so doing, it may in some
 way have violated the neutrality of the Norman coast.

Or Æthelred, in his present fit of energy, may have
 been so indignant at the reception of the Danes in the
 Norman havens as to send out an expedition by way of
 reprisal. But the grotesque pride and folly implied in
 the Norman story is incredible even in Æthelred. The
 details are valuable only as showing the sort of tales
 which, as we shall see more abundantly as we go on,
 the Norman writers thought good to pass off as the
 English history of the time.

Whatever was the exact nature of the mutual wrongs Marriage
 of Æthel-
 red and
 Emma; its
 evil re-
 sults.
 now done to each other by Normans and Englishmen, the
 quarrel did not last long. Æthelred was now a widower;
 the peace between the two countries was therefore con-
 firmed by a marriage between him and the Duke's sister
 Emma, one of the legitimated children of Richard the
 Fearless and Gunnor.¹ Her beauty and accomplishments
 are highly extolled, but her long connexion with England, 1002-1051.
 as the wife of two Kings and the mother of two others,
 brought with it nothing but present evil and led to the
 future overthrow of the English kingdom and nation.
 The marriage of Æthelred and Emma led directly to the

¹ See above, p. 279.

CHAP. V. Norman Conquest of England.¹ With that marriage began the settlement of Normans in England, their admission to English offices and estates, their general influence in English affairs, all, in short, that paved the way for the actual Conquest. Through Emma came that fatal kindred and friendship between her English son and her Norman great-nephew, which suggested and rendered possible the enterprise which seated her great-nephew on the throne of England. From the moment of this marriage, English and Norman history are inextricably connected, and Norman ingenuity was ever ready to take any advantage of every event to strengthen the foreign influence in England. The former dispute between Æthelred and the elder Richard was a mere prologue; we have now reached the first act of the drama. If an English fleet really did sail to Normandy and ravage the Côtentin peninsula, those ships were like the ships which Athens sent across the Ægæan at the bidding of Aristagoras—they were indeed the beginning of evils.²

Emma
comes to
England.
1002.

The marriage however did not take place for two years. According to one story Æthelred went over to Normandy to bring home his bride in person.³ The evidence is dis-

¹ On this marriage and its results see the opening of the Sixth Book of Henry of Huntingdon. He clearly sees the connexion of events, and he as clearly believes that William's kindred with Emma gave him some right to the English Crown. "Ex hac conjunctione Regis Anglorum et filiæ Ducis Normannorum, Angliam justè, secundum jus gentium, Normanni et calumniati sunt et adepti sunt." This is perhaps the strangest theory of International Law on record.

² Herod. v. 97. αὐται δὲ αἱ νέες ἀρχὴ κακῶν ἐγένοντο Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροισι.

³ No writer mentions this but Geoffrey Gaimar (4126. M.H.B. 814), who is followed by Sir F. Palgrave (iii. 109). Henry of Huntingdon (M.H.B. 751 E) and Æthelred of Rievaulx (X Scriptt. 362) distinctly make him send messengers. The statement of the Chronicles, which of course would be decisive, is less distinct, but it looks the same way; "And ða ðn ðam ilcan lenctene com seo hlæfdige, Ricardes dohtor, hider to lande." "And on ðysan ylcan geare, on lencten, com Ricardes dohtor Ymma hider to lande."

tingly the other way, but to go on such an errand, when CHAP. V.

the miseries of war were at their height, was perhaps in character with a prince so apt to be enterprising at the wrong moment. A like piece of vigorous courtship is the one act of energy recorded of Æthelred's descendant, James, Sixth of Scotland and First of England. If

1589.

Æthelred really did go over to Normandy, he was the first English King, since Ælfred in his childhood, who set foot on the Continent, as his son Eadmund was the last for several centuries who did not.¹ And a foreign Queen

A foreign Queen most unusual in England.

was something quite as strange to Englishmen as a visit of an English King to foreign lands. The marriage of English princesses to foreign rulers had been common from the days of Ælfred onwards; but a foreign Lady by the side of an English King had not been seen since

855.

Æthelwulf brought home the young daughter of Charles the Bald.² And the marriage of Æthelwulf and Judith was probably the first instance since the Frankish princess whom Augustine found as the Queen of the Kentish Bretwalda.³ And the stranger Queens alike of Æthelberht and of Æthelred came as the forerunners of mighty changes.

561-597.

The foreign marriage of Æthelberht paved the way for the admission of the Teutonic and heathen island into the common fold of the Christian commonwealth. The foreign marriage of Æthelred paved the way for the more complete fusion of England into the general European system, by giving her a foreign King, a foreign nobility, and, for many purposes, a foreign tongue. It shows the strong insular feeling of the nation, and it curiously illustrates the history of English nomenclature, that the foreign Lady had to assume an English name. The English

Emma changes her name to Ælfgifu.

¹ I cannot answer positively for Harold the son of Cnut, but we shall come across evidence which makes it probable that he visited Denmark.

² Chron. 855, and Florence (after Asser) more at length.

³ Greg. Turon. iv. 26. Bæda, i. 25.

CHAP. V. dations of that power, which, in the hands of their kinsmen of other dynasties, was to overwhelm alike Constantinople and Bulgaria and all other realms from the Indus to the Hadriatic. In Southern Europe, Otto the Wonder of the World was running that short and marvellous career which, for a moment, seemed to promise that Rome should again become, in deed as well as in name, the seat of universal Empire. The prospects of England seemed darker than those of any other corner of Europe. In the East and in the South, if old systems were falling, new ones were rising, but our island seemed given up to simple desolation and havoc. It would appear that, though the mass of the Danish fleet had sailed to Normandy, a portion must have remained in their old quarters in the Solent. Some at least among the Danes had taken service under the English King. Such was the case with Pallig, a Danish Earl, evidently of the highest rank, as he was married to Gunhild, a sister of King Swend himself.¹ His wife, and probably himself, had embraced Christianity, and he had received large gifts from the King, both in money and in land. The Danes who had remained in England now burst into Sussex, and ravaged as far as a place called Æthelingadene.² They then pressed on into Hampshire, and, as so often happened, they were met by the men of the shire, and by the men of that shire only. The details of the battle are unusually exact; eighty-one of the English were killed, and a much greater number of the Danes, but the Danes kept possession of the place of slaughter. Among the English dead were several men

Danes in
the English
service;
Pallig.

Invasion of
Sussex and
Hamp-
shire.
1001.

¹ W. Malm. ii. 177.

² I have here tried to put together the account in the Winchester Chronicle (C.C.C.C. clxxiii.), which alone mentions Pallig and the Hampshire campaign, with the account of the operations in Devonshire given in the other versions. Æthelingadene has been taken for Alton in Hampshire, but Æthelingadene would hardly make Alton, and the place is in Sussex. See Cod. Dipl. iii. 324.

of rank,¹ including two "high-reeves" of the King—probably the Sheriffs of Hampshire and Sussex—Æthelweard and Leofwine. The Danes then went westward, seemingly in concert with the fleet which was coming back from Normandy. But they were first met by Pallig, who had already forsaken the service of Æthelred, and who now joined them with such ships as he could bring with him. They sailed up the Teign, and burned King's Teignton² and other places. After this, peace—no doubt the usual kind of peace—was made with them. But by this time they had fallen in with their comrades. The Danes who had sailed to Normandy now came back, no doubt still further embittered at Æthelred's doings in that country, whatever may have been their exact nature. The fleet seems to have sailed straight from Normandy to the mouth of the Exe; they were there met by the other Danes, Pallig and the rest, and their united forces sailed up the river.³ About ten miles from its mouth lay a city⁴ which held nearly the same position in the West of England which York held in the North and London in the South-East. The Roman city of Isca had not fallen into the power of the Teutonic

CHAP. V.

Treason of Pallig.

Return of the Danes from Normandy.

Importance of Exeter; early history of the city.

¹ Their descriptions, as given in the Winchester Chronicle, are worth noticing. There is Wulfhere the Bishop's Thegn, and two who are called from their dwelling-places, Leofric æt Hwiticricean (Whitchurch) and Godwine æt Worðige (Worthy Martyr), Bishop Ælfsige's son. This is Ælfsige, Bishop of Winchester, who was translated to Canterbury in 959, but died of the cold on the Alps on his way to Rome to get his pall. (Flor. Wig. 959.)

² See Mr. Earle's note on the Chronicles, p. 334.

³ I get this from the words of the Winchester Chronicle, which mentions one part of the story only, combined with those of Florence, who mentions only the other part. The Winchester writer mentions the campaign in Hampshire, the treason of Pallig, the burning of Teignton, the peace, and adds, "and by foran þa þanon tō Exanmuðan." Florence has, "Memoratus Paganorum exercitus, de Normanniâ Angliam revector, ostium fluminis Eaxæ ingreditur." This seems to be a satisfactory way of explaining it. The other Chronicles have simply, "Her com *se here* to Exanmuðan."

⁴ The language of the Chronicles is remarkable. The fleet comes to Exmouth, "and eodon þa up to þære byrig." There was no need to mention what borough. But Florence adds "urbem Exanceastram."

CHAP. V. invaders till after their conversion to Christianity; it therefore had not shared the fate which befell Anderida at the hands of Ælle and Uriconium at the hands of Ceawlin. Under the slightly changed name of Exanceaster or Exeter, the capital and bulwark of the Western shires had long formed one of the choicest possessions of the West-Saxon Kings. Its possession had been warmly contested between

877. Ælfred and his Danish enemies, and more than one capture and recapture of the city had marked the fluctuations of

Exeter,
hitherto
half Welsh,
becomes
purely
English
under
Æthelstan,
and is
strongly
fortified.
926.

his earlier struggle with the invaders. Up to the time of Æthelstan Exeter had remained, as many towns in Wales and Ireland remained for ages afterwards, a common possession of Teutonic and Celtic inhabitants.¹ No doubt there was an English and a Welsh town, an Englishry and a Welshry, and we may be equally certain that the English inhabitants formed a dominant class or patriariate among their fellow-burghers. But Æthelstan, in the course of his Western wars, thought it good that so important a post should be left in no hands but such as he could wholly rely on. The Welsh inhabitants were accordingly removed; the city became altogether English; a solemn Assembly of the Witan was held to commemorate and to confirm the new acquisition, and a portion of the Laws of Æthelstan were put forth in the now purely English city of Exeter.² The town was now strongly fortified; it was surrounded with a wall of squared stones,³ a fact worthy

Witenage-
mót and
Laws of
Exeter.

¹ See W. Malms. ii. 134. Palgrave, English Commonwealth, i. 463.

² Thorpe, i. 220, 228. Schmid, 152, 156.

³ W. Malms. u. s. "Urbem igitur illam, quam contaminatæ gentis repurgio defæcaverat, turribus munivit, muro ex quadratis lapidibus cinxit." Eadward the Elder had before fortified Towcester with a stone wall, ("lapideo muro," Fl. Wig. 918), but the wall of Exeter is distinctly said to have been of squared stone. The difference between a hedge and a wall was known ages before, when Ida fortified Bamborough. "Sy was ærest mid hegge betined, and þær æfter mid wealle" (Chron. 547); but this "wall" need not have been of stone.

In short our accounts help us to four stages in the history of fortification.

of the attention of those fathers before the Norman Conquest were incapable of using the commonest tools, or of putting stone and mortar together in any way. The chief architectural ornament of the city had indeed no existence. The cathedral church, Exeter not yet a Bishop's See. so strange in its outline, so commanding in its position, did not yet crown the height which, alone among the episcopal seats of Southern England, makes some pretensions to rival the temples built on high at Lincoln and at Durham, at Geneva and at Lausanne. Indeed, like Lincoln and Durham, it had not even a predecessor. Exeter was not yet a Bishop's see; the episcopal superintendence of West-Wales was still divided between the Bishop of Devonshire at Crediton and the Bishop of Cornwall at Bodmin. The history of the city at a somewhat later time seems to show that it enjoyed a large share of municipal freedom; still it clearly did not form an independent commonwealth, like London. As an integral part of the West-Saxon realm, it was a royal possession, and was governed, or at least defended in time of war, by a royal Reeve. Both the commercial and the military importance of the city were of the first rank. In our days the trade of Exeter has long vanished; commerce has long been carried on in vessels which require a deeper stream; as early as the thirteenth century the trade of the city itself began to be interfered with by the foundation of the port of Topsham at the mouth of the river. But the small craft of the tenth century could sail straight up to the city for purposes either of commerce or of war. The Danes now attacked Exeter, just as they had attacked London; but the citizens of the Western capital fought with as

Municipal condition of the city.

Its commercial and military importance.

The Danes attack the city, but are driven off by the citizens.

First, the hedge or palisade; secondly, the wall of earth, or of earth and rough stones combined; thirdly, the wall of masonry, as at Towcester; fourthly, the wall of squared stones, as at Exeter. The fifth stage, the Norman castle, does not appear till the reign of Eadward the Confessor.

CHAP. V. good a will, and with as complete success, as their brethren of the East.¹ King Æthelstan's wall stood them in good stead,² and the attack of the barbarians was altogether fruitless. But the result of the resistance of Exeter was much the same as the result of the resistance of London. The city was saved, but, for that very reason,³ the ravages of the invaders fell with redoubled violence upon the surrounding country. Æthelred was as unready as ever; the host which had been prompt to ravage Cumberland, and perhaps Normandy, was not at hand to aid any local efforts. The Danes spread themselves over the country, ravaging, burning, killing, in their accustomed manner. The men of Somersetshire and Devonshire gathered their forces, and met the enemy at Penhow, not far from the rescued city. But the force of two shires was not enough for the purpose. The Danes had the advantage of numbers,⁴ and put the irregular English levies to flight. They then, as usual, took to themselves horses, and ravaged the country still more thoroughly and unsparingly than before. At last they went back to their ships with a vast booty, and sailed to their old quarters in the Isle of Wight. Thence they carried on their usual devastations, both in the island and on the coasts of Hampshire and Dorset, no man now daring to withstand them.

Devon-
shire
ravaged,
and the
Defnsætas
and Sumor-
sætas de-
feated at
Penhow.

Witena-
gemót of
1001.

The Witan met in the course of this year in an assembly which confirmed a grant of the King's to the Abbey of Shaftesbury, which is remarkable on two grounds. It distinctly sets forth the wretchedness of the times in a way rather unusual in such documents, and it shows that the King's brother Eadward was already looked on

¹ Chron. in anno. "þær fæstlice feohtende wæron, æc him man swyðe fæstlice wiðstod and heardlice."

² Fl. Wig. in anno. "Dum murum illius destruere moliretur, a civibus urbem viriliter defendentibus repellitur [Paganorum exercitus]."

³ Ib. "Unde nimis exasperatos more solito," &c.

⁴ Ib. "Angli pro militum paucitate, Danorum multitudinem non ferentes."

as a saint.¹ Another meeting was held early the next year, in which the King granted to Archbishop Ælfric the estate of a lady which she had forfeited to the Crown by her unchastity.² Possibly at the same meeting, or at another in the same year, Æthelingadene, the scene of one of the late battles, and some other property, were granted by Æthelred to the monastery of Wherwell, his mother's foundation, for the good of her soul and of that of his father.³ It may be that in all this we hear the voice of his brother's blood crying from the ground.⁴ But the state of the nation was not altogether neglected; the Assembly of the Wise however could think of nothing better than the old wretched remedy which had so often failed them. The Danes were again to be bought off at their own terms, and the Ealdorman Leofsige was sent to find out what those terms were.⁵ They now, fairly enough, raised their price; twenty-four thousand pounds was asked and was paid as the condition of their

CHAP. V.

First
Gemót of
1002.Charters
granted
at it.Payment
again made
to the
Danes.

¹ Cod. Dipl. iii. 318. "Talibus mandatorum Christi sententiis a meis frequentius præmonitus consiliariis, et ab ipso summo omnium largitore bonorum dirissimis hostium graviter nos depopulantium creberrime angustatus flagellis, ego Æðelredus Rex Anglorum, [an unusually lowly style] ut supradictæ merear particeps fore promissionis, quoddam Christo et sancto suo, germano scilicet meo, Eadwardo, quem proprio cruore perfusum per multiplicia virtutum signa, ipse Dominus nostris mirificare dignatus est temporibus." &c. &c. So afterwards, "quatenus adversus barbarorum insidias ipsa religiosa congregatio cum beati martyris cæterorumque sanctorum reliquiis," &c., and "adepto postmodum, si Dei misericordia ita providerit, pacis tempore." The observance of Eadward's mass-day was ordered in 1008.

² Ib. vi. 140.

³ Ib. iii. 322. Ælfthryth could not have been dead very long, as she signs the Charter of 999, in which the treason of Ælfric (see above, p. 307) is mentioned. Cod. Dipl. iii. 312.

⁴ So William of Malmesbury, ii. 165; "Exagitabant illum umbræ fraternæ, diras exigentes inferias." Yet Æthelred had no share in the murder; he only reaped, quite unconsciously, the advantage of his mother's crime.

⁵ The joint action of the King and the Witan is well marked in the Chronicles; "þa sende se cyning to þam flotan Leofsige ealdorman; and he þa, þæs cyninges worde and his witenas, grið wið hi gesette."

CHAP. V. ceasing from their ravages. But, while the negociation was going on, the negociator, on what ground or in what quarrel we are not told, killed the King's high-reeve Ælfic, and was outlawed and driven out of the land for his crime. The Witan were doubtless still in session, and they must have taken cognizance of the murder.¹ All this must have happened early in the year, as it was after these events, though still in Lent,² that the young Queen came over. Before the year was out, another Witenagemót was held,³ at which Æthelred and his counsellors contrived to do what otherwise might have seemed impossible, to put the heathen invaders in the right. This winter, on the mass-day of Saint Brice, took place that famous massacre of the Danes, which has given an admirable opportunity for the exaggerated and romantic details of later writers, but which stands out in bloody colours enough on the page of authentic history. According to our best authorities, tidings were brought to the King that the Danes who were in England were plotting with one consent to kill him and his Witan and to seize upon the Kingdom.⁴

Leofsige outlawed.

Emma comes over.

Second or Third Gemót of 1002.

Massacre of the Danes, November, 1002.

Plot of the Danes to kill the King and his Witan.

¹ Here the King only is mentioned, but we commonly hear of the Witan sharing in such sentences, and the meeting would hardly break up till the negotiations were complete, and resolutions taken for raising the money.

² "On þam ilcan lenctene." I do not know why Mr. Thorpe translates it "autumn."

³ To this meeting belongs the grant to the Thegn Godwine (Cod. Dipl. vi. 143), as it is signed by "Ælfgifu conlaterana Regis." But the following document (No. 1297) belongs to an earlier meeting, I suspect to an intermediate one. This year Ealdwulf Archbishop of York died and was succeeded by Wulfstan Bishop of London, not Abbot Wulfstan, as Florence has it. Now the Charter quoted above (Cod. Dipl. iii. 322) is signed by Ealdwulf and by Wulfstan as Bishop. This of course belongs to the first meeting. The Charter to Godwine, which the Queen signs, is also signed by Wulfstan as Archbishop. But No. 1297 (Cod. Dipl. vi. 145) is signed by Wulfstan as Bishop and not by Ealdwulf. This seems to point to an intermediate Gemót, held while the See of York was vacant, and at which Wulfstan was probably nominated to it.

⁴ Chron. in anno. "On þam geare se cyng hét ofslean ealle þá Deniscan men þe on Angelcynne wæron. Ðis wæs gedon on Britius massedæg ;

Except that other means intended, this sounds very like a forestalling of the Gunpowder Plot. The Danes were indeed thoroughly faithless, but an intended general massacre of the whole Witen-gemót when in full session, which the words seem to imply, is hardly credible.¹ Another attack on London or Exeter, or a devastation of some district as yet untouched, would be much more likely. One cannot help suspecting that we have here a good deal of exaggeration, exaggeration, I mean, not in the *Chronicles*, but in the reports spread abroad at the time by Æthelred and his advisers. However this may be, the King, no doubt with the consent of the second (or third) Gemót of the year, ordered a general massacre of all the Danes in England, an order which could never have been carried into execution if it had not been supported by the general hatred of the whole nation. It is said that letters were secretly sent to all parts of the Kingdom, ordering the execution of the bloody work throughout the whole land on one day.² The persons slain were probably such among those Danes who had served in the late invasions as had remained in England on the faith of the treaty concluded in the spring. A general

Probable
extent of
the mas-
sacre.

forðam þam cyninge was gecyð þat hi woldan hine besyrwan æt his life, and siððan ealle his witan, and habban sibban þis rice."

Flor. in anno. "Quo etiam anno rex Ægelredus omnes Danos Angliam incolentes, majores et minores, utriusque sexûs, occidi jussit: quia illum suosque primates vitâ regnoque privare, et totius Angliæ dominium sæditioni conati sunt subdere."

¹ Will. Malm. ii. 165. "Levibus suspicionibus omnes uno die in totâ Angliâ trucidari jusserat."

² Henry of Huntingdon mentions the letters, so does Æthelred of Rievaulx (362). Henry professes to get his information from old men whom he had seen in his childhood. It is hardly possible that he could have seen men who had been actually eye-witnesses of the massacre; still his tale may represent a prevalent tradition. He does not mention the plot, but attributes the deed to Æthelred's pride and elation at his new connexion with Normandy! Æthelred of Rievaulx speaks sarcastically of his royal namesake as "fortior solito."

CHAP. V. massacre of all persons of Danish descent throughout England is not to be thought of; such a massacre would have amounted to an extirpation of a large portion of the inhabitants of Northumberland and East-Anglia. There is nothing in the earliest account to imply that any but men were slaughtered, and, among the Danes, every man was a soldier, or rather a pirate. But the tale began very early to get improved by all kinds of romantic additions. We first hear of a massacre of Danish women;¹ then, among an infinite variety of horrors of all sorts, we come to a massacre of English women who had become wives or mistresses of Danes, and of the children who were the fruit of such unions.² It is not likely that there were many Danish women to massacre, and the notion of a massacre of women at all most likely arose out of one particular case. That Gunhild, the wife of Pallig and sister of Swend, was put to death is too probable, especially if it be true that she had given herself³ as a hostage for the good faith of her countrymen. The prince who

Murder of
Gunhild.

¹ Even in Florence we have "*utriusque sexus*."

² We get the first hint of all this in a piece of fine writing of William of Malmesbury (ii. 165); "*Ubi fuit videre miseriam, dum quisque carissimos hospites, quos etiam arctissima necessitudo dulciores effecerat, cogeretur prodere, et amplexus gladio deturbare.*" From John of Wallingford (Gale, ii. 547), who died in 1214, we may learn a great deal more. The Danes made themselves too acceptable to the English women by their elegant manners and their care of their persons. They combed their hair daily, and took a bath every Saturday. So they were all killed on their bathing-day. Saint Brice's day really did fall on a Saturday this year. Roger of Wendover (i. 444) does not know quite so much; but he attributes the massacre to the rapes, not the seductions, of English women by the Danes. He also removes the event to the year 1013, and makes the author of it one Huna, who is unknown to history but whom we shall meet again in romance. It may be noticed that John of Wallingford is satisfied with cutting off the breasts of the women, while William of Jumièges (v. 6) has them torn off by dogs, and the Roman de Rou (6387-9) by bears. So tales grow.

³ Roger of Wendover adds that her husband and son were both hostages, a thing utterly incredible in the case of Pallig.

blinded the son of Ælfrie and who afterwards took favour, was capable even of so cowardly and foolish a vengeance as this. The traitor Pallig, if he was caught, would doubtless be put to death, and with perfect justice, unless he was personally included in the last treaty. And it may be that Gunhild had to behold the slaughter of her husband and her son,² and that with her dying voice she foretold the woes which her death would bring upon England. Such a prediction needed no special prophetic inspiration.

§ 4. *From the Massacre of Saint Brice to Swend's Conquest of England. 1002-1013.*

The Vespers of Saint Brice were not only a crime but a blunder. From this time forth the Danish invasions become far more constant, far more systematic, and they affect a far larger portion of the kingdom. The next year King Swend came again in person.³ He now had a real injury; the blood of his sister and his countrymen might have called for vengeance at the hands of a gentler and more forgiving prince. He did not land in any of those parts of the island where we should have most naturally looked for the opening of a campaign; he began his attack in the region which had been the chief seat of warfare for years before. Most likely he knew well where the weakness of England lay. The Danish King sailed to Exeter, the city whose burghers had so gallantly repelled the former attack. But the state of things within the walls of the

Results of the massacre.

Invasion by Swend in person. 1003.

Exeter betrayed to Swend by Hugh the Frenchman.

¹ See above, p. 308.

² Will. Malm. ii. 177. The mother was of course beautiful ("non illepide formæ virago") and the son promising ("commodæ indolis puer").

³ Florence mentions him at Exeter, the Chronicles not till later in the year, but they seem to take him for granted.

CHAP. V. western capital was now changed sadly for the worse. The royal rights over Exeter had been granted to the Norman Lady as part of her morning-gift. Hugh, a Frenchman, whether Earl or Churl¹ matters not, was now the royal Reeve in Exeter, the first of a long line of foreigners who, under Emma, her son, and her great-nephew, were to fatten on English estates and honours. Hugh was a coward or a traitor, most likely both. Exeter was stormed and plundered; the noble walls of King Æthelstan were broken down from the east gate to the west, and the city was left defenceless.² Swend returned to his ships with a vast plunder, and then went on to the harrying of Wiltshire. The men of that shire and their neighbours of Hampshire were gathered together, ready and eager to meet the enemy in battle. The people were as sound at heart as they had been three years before, but they had no longer the same valiant leaders. The battle of Æthelingadene seems to have fallen with special severity on the chief men, and we now find the force of these two shires in the last hands in which we should have looked to find them. The old traitor Ælfric,³ who had done his best, eleven years before,⁴ to betray London

Swend
ravages
Wiltshire.
A battle
hindered
by Ælfric,
again in
command
of the
English.

¹ The Chronicles have, "her was Exanceaster abrocen þuruh þone Franciscan *ceorl* Hugan, ƿe seo hlæfdige hire hæfde geset to gerefan." But Florence has, "per insilium [consilium?] incuriam, et traditionem Nortmannici *comitis* Hugonis, quem Regina Emma Domnanizæ præfecit." Henry of Huntingdon (752 B) says, "Hugonem Normannum, quem ibi Regina Emma Vicecomitem [gerefan?] statuerat, in perniciem compegerunt." Florence seems to have read *eorl* where our copies of the Chronicles have *ceorl*; also he seems to make Hugh Ealdorman of Devonshire, while in the Chronicles he is only Reeve of Exeter. The "Frenchmen" of the Chronicles may always be either Normans or not; most likely Hugh was a Norman.

² Flor. Wig. "Civitatem Exanceastram infregit, spoliavit, murum ab orientali usque ad occidentalem portam destruxit." This does not imply the complete destruction of the city. But Henry of Huntingdon says, "urbem totam funditus destruxerunt," which is doubtless an exaggeration.

³ "Alfricus dux supra memoratus" says Florence; it is clear that this is the Ælfric, the traitor of 992.

⁴ See above, p. 307.

to the enemy, who had himself been driven from the land, and whose innocent son had paid a cruel penalty for his offence, was now, through some unrecorded and inexplicable intrigue, again in royal favour, again in command of an English army, again trusted to oppose the very enemy with whom he had before traitorously leagued himself. But, as our *Chronicles* tell us with a vigorous simplicity, he was again at his old tricks; as soon as the armies were so near that they could look on one another, the English commander pretended to be taken suddenly ill;¹ retchings and spittings followed as a proof of his sickness; in such a case a battle could not possibly be thought of. One wonders that no brave man, however unauthorized, seized the command by common consent,² but the paltry trick was successful; the spirits of the English were broken, and they went away sadly without a battle.³ In all this history, just as in old Greek history,⁴ we are often surprised at the mere accidents on which the fate of battles depends, how much one man's valour or cowardice or treason can bring about, how much turns on the mood in which the soldiers find themselves at the moment of action. In this case the English are described as having come together with the utmost good will, and as being thoroughly eager to do their duty. Yet a transparent artifice at once paralyses them, and they become wholly incapable of action. We must remember that here, just as in Greece, we are dealing, not with professional soldiers, but with citizen soldiers; we are dealing with

Fluctuation of spirits among non-professional soldiers.

¹ Chron. 1003. "Ða gebræd he hine seocne, and ongan he hine brecaan to spiwenne, and cwæð þæt he geseicled wære."

² Like Lydiadas at Ladokeia and Philopoimên at Sellasia. See Hist. Fed. Gov. i. 450, 497.

³ Flor. Wig. "A suis inimicis sine pugna divertit moestissimus." The *Chronicles*, and after them Florence and Henry, quote a proverb, "þonne se heretoga wacað, þonne bið eall se here swiðe gehindred."

⁴ See many passages in Grote's History of Greece, especially the remarks on the death of Epameinondas; x. 477.

CHAP. V. times when every man was a soldier occasionally, and when none but professed pirates were soldiers constantly. Such soldiers are not mere machines in the hand of a master of the game; they do not simply do their professional duty in blind obedience; they have a real part and interest in what is going on; they are therefore liable to be affected by the ordinary feelings of men in a way in which professional soldiers are much less strongly affected. Such men are specially liable to fluctuations of the spirits; they are easily encouraged and easily disheartened; men who fight like heroes one day may be overcome by a sudden panic the next. Hence the extraordinary importance which, in all such warfare, attaches to the personal exhortation and personal example of the general with such troops; a chief who simply stands aloof and gives orders can never win a victory. The particular speech put into the mouth of a general before battle is no doubt commonly the invention of the historian; but that generals found it needful to make such speeches, and that such speeches had a most important effect on the spirit and conduct of their armies, is palpable in every history of warfare of this kind. No doubt even professional soldiers still remain men, and are liable to be in some degree affected in the same way; still habit and discipline make a great change; an army in which each man is really fighting for his hearth and home is liable to these influences in a tenfold degree. In this case, if some brave man had stepped forward, had cut down the cowardly traitor, and had called on the English to follow him against the enemy, a battle would have been certain and a victory probable. No man had the energy to do this; therefore the base trick of Ælfric thoroughly succeeded, and the English host went away without striking a blow. But, even in retreat, it must have been formidable, as it seems to have been left quite unmolested by the enemy. But the whole shire was left defenceless.

The town of Wilton was sacked and burned. Swend then indeed the modern city in the singular absence of beauty on its own part, circling, with a singular graceful of West-Saxon minsters. The Salisbury of those days was still the old hill-fortress,¹ where the Briton and the Roman had entrenched themselves, and at whose foot Cynric had won one of those great battles which mark the western stages of the Teutonic invasion. After the days of Swend a Norman castle and a Norman cathedral rose and fell on that historic spot, and the chosen stronghold of so many races lived to become one of the bye-words of modern political discussion. Like Exeter, Salisbury was not yet a Bishop's See; but the choice of the town at the end of the century as the seat of the Bishoprick of Wiltshire and Dorsetshire shows that it must already have been a place of importance according to the standard of the time. Yet one would think that its importance must always have been mainly that of a military post; one can hardly conceive Old Sarum being at any time a place of trade or the centre of any considerable population. Whatever the place consisted of at this time, Swend sacked and burned it, and returned to his ships with great spoil.²

CHAP. V.

Swend sacks and burns Wilton and Salisbury.

Old Sarum.

552.

The events of the next year form the exact converse of the tale which I have just told. We have seen the spirit of a gallant army foully damped by the malice of a single

Exploits of Ulfcytel of East-Anglia. 1004.

¹ II. xx. 216.

κτίσσε δὲ Δαρδανίην, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἴλιος ἰρή
ἐν πεδίῳ πεπόλιστο, πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων,
ἀλλ' ἔθ' ὑπερείας ἔκειον πολυπιδάκου Ἰδης·

Πολυπιδάκος, however, I fear would be the most inappropriate of epithets for Old Sarum, which, in the days of its greatness, was "well provided otherwise of all commodities, but wanted water so unreasonably as (a strange kind of merchandise) it was there to be sold." (Godwin.)

² The Chronicler here, though writing in prose, gets poetical. "þær he wiste his yð hengestas."

CHAP. V. traitor. We shall now see the efforts of a single hero, boldly struggling against every difficulty, feebly backed by those who should have supported him, and winning, in a succession of defeats, a glory as pure as that of the most triumphant of conquerors. This man was Ulfcytel, Earl, or at least military commander, of the East-Angles, one whose name proclaims his Danish origin, but in whom England now found her stoutest champion in her hour of need.¹ This next summer Swend directed his course to a part of England which was largely peopled by men of his own race, to the old Kingdom of Guthrum. His appearance was sudden; he sailed to the mouth of the Yare, pushed his way up the stream, and stormed and burned the town which had arisen at the point of its junction with the Wensum. Norwich was in East-Anglia what Exeter was in the Western shires. But the city itself could not boast of the same antiquity as the Damnonian Isca. The changes of the waters in that region had caused the British and Roman site to be forsaken; the Icenian Venta survived only in the vague designation of Caistor, common to it with many other Roman towns whose distinctive names have been forgotten. On a height at no great distance the East-Anglian Kings had raised a fortress, which was the rude forerunner of one of the stateliest of Norman castles, one which immediately suggests a name than which few

Swend surprises and burns Norwich.

History of the city.

Norwich Castle.

¹ I speak with some doubt as to Ulfcytel's formal rank. The Latin writers all give him the title of Earl. "*Magnæ strenuitatis Dux East-Anglorum Ulfketel.*" (Florence.) "*Wlfketel Dux illius provincie.*" (H. Huntingdon.) "*Comes Orientalium Anglorum Ulfkillus.*" (W. Malmesbury.) But the Chronicles do not give it him in this place, though they do by implication in recording his death in 1016. Also I can find no signature of Ulfcytel as Earl, though many charters, both before and after this date, are signed by Ulfcytel, "miles" or "minister." On the other hand, as commanding the army and summoning the Witan, he acts with the full authority of an Earl. May he have been in some way the deputy of Æthelweard, son of the former Ealdorman Æthelwine, who died along with Ulfcytel at Assandun?

in our history are more illustrious. The castle of Norwich became the stronghold of the Earls of the house of Bigod, one of whom lived to wrest the final confirmation of the liberties of England from the hands of the Great Edward himself. As at Exeter, as at Salisbury, the Norman castle had already a rude forerunner, but the Norman cathedral had none. The Bishop of the East-Angles still had his see at Elmham. A twofold translation at the end of the century, first to Thetford and then to Norwich, points out those two towns as being at this time the most considerable in the district, and we accordingly find them the principal objects of hostile attack. Norwich was now one of the most important seats of commerce in England; the city had been greatly favoured by several successive Kings, and it enjoyed the privilege of a mint. A place thus rich and flourishing was naturally marked as a prey by the invaders, who harried and burned it, seemingly without resistance. The blow was so sudden that even a guardian like Ulfcytel was unprepared. He now gathered together the provincial council, the Witan of East-Anglia,¹ whose mention shows how much of independence the ancient Kingdom still retained. Peace was patched up with the invaders, who seemingly returned to their ships. But, three weeks afterwards, the Danes broke the peace, and marched secretly to Thetford, the town in the district next in importance to Norwich. This march seems to have led them to a greater distance from the coast than any Danish army had ventured since the old invasions in Ælfred's time. Their movement did not escape the watchful eye of Ulfcytel,² and the plan which

1297.

Norwich not yet a Bishop's See.

Importance of the town.

Norwich burned by Swend.

Ulfcytel and the Witan of East-Anglia make peace with the Danes.

The Danes break the peace and march on Thetford.

Plans of Ulfcytel.

¹ Chron. in anno. "þa gærædde Ulfcytel wið þa Witan on East-Englum." Flor. Wig. "Cum majoribus East-Angliæ habito concilio." See Kemble, ii. 257.

² So I understand the narrative in the Chronicles, which seems to imply that the measures of Ulfcytel were taken as soon as the Danes began their march, but before they reached Thetford, while Florence does not

CHAP. V. he formed, though not wholly successful, seems to vouch for his generalship. He at once gathered his forces together as secretly as he could, and sent a detachment to the coast to destroy the ships of the invaders. In this latter part of his scheme he wholly failed; those whom he sent on that errand proved either cowardly or unfaithful. And, even with the force under his own command, he was unable to save Thetford. The town was entered by the Danes, who plundered it, stayed there one night, and in the morning set fire to it and marched away towards their ships. But they were hardly clear of the burning town when Ulfcytel came upon them with his army. That army was comparatively small; had the whole force of East-Anglia been there, so our authors tell us, never would the heathen men have got back to their ships. As it was, the Danes themselves said that never met they in all England with worse handplay than Ulfcytel brought upon them.¹ It seems to have been a drawn battle. The Danes so far succeeded that they were able to accomplish their object of reaching their ships; but the fighting was hard, and the slaughter great on both sides, and we do not, as usual, hear of either side keeping the field. As at Maldon, as at Æthelingadene, the slaughter on the English side seems to have fallen most heavily on those who were high in rank or command.² No doubt, in all these battles, just as in the battles of Homer, the chief stress of the fight fell on the Thegns of the King or Earl in command, especially on the high-born youths who were personally attached to mention Ulfcytel as doing anything till after he hears of the burning of the town.

Thetford
plundered
and
burned.

Drawn
battle
between
Swend and
Ulfcytel.

Severe loss
among the
English
leaders.

¹ I modernize the words of the Chronicles. "Swa hi sylfe sædon, þæt hi næfre wyrzan handplegan on Angelcynne ne gemetton, þonne Ulfcytel him to brohte." So Florence, "ut enim ipsi testati sunt, durius et asperius bellum in Angliâ numquam experti sunt quam illis Dux Ulfketel intulerat." See Will. Malm. ii. 165, for a longer panegyric on Ulfcytel.

² Chron. in anno. "þær wearð East-Engla folces seo *ylð* [*ylðesta*] ofslægan." See on the sense of this word and its cognates, p. 78.

him and his service. Maldon, where we have it was so at Thetford, the result. This East-Anglian campaign is also a good illustration of the general conditions of warfare at the time. It shows the difficulty with which the force, whether of the whole Kingdom or of a single Earldom, could be got together, and how much was lost through mere slowness of operations. Even with a vigorous chief at the head, the two chief towns of the Earldom were surprised and burned. But the story shows no less plainly how much a single faithful and valiant leader could do to struggle with these difficulties. A shire under the government of Ulfcytel was in a very different case from a shire under the government of Ælfric. Nay, could Ulfcytel, instead of holding a subordinate command, have changed places with the boastful Emperor of all Britain, we can well believe that the whole story of the Danish wars would have had a very different ending.

Illustrations supplied by Ulfcytel's campaign.

The resistance of Ulfcytel, though not wholly successful, seems to have had at least a share in winning for England a momentary respite. We hear of no further ravages after the battle of Thetford, and the next year King Swend, instead of attacking any part of England, sailed home again to Denmark. A famine, the most fearful ever remembered in England, was most likely in part the result of his ravages, and it no doubt also helped to send him away for a while from the wasted land. The Witan met in the course of the year, but we have no record of any proceedings more important than the usual grants to monasteries and to the King's Thegns.¹ But the next year is crowded with events of all kinds. We now come to the rise of a man who was to be even more com-

Year of respite and of famine. 1005.

Events of the year 1006.

¹ Cod. Dipl. iii. 339. vi. 152.

CHAP. V. pletely the evil genius of the later years of this unhappy reign than Ælfric had been the evil genius of its earlier years. This was Eadric, surnamed Streona, the son of Æthelric,¹ who is described as a man of low birth, of a shrewd intellect—which he used only to devise selfish and baleful schemes—of an eloquent tongue—which he used only to persuade men to mischief—as proud, cruel, envious, and faithless. From elaborate pictures of this sort we instinctively make some deductions; still the character of Eadric is written plainly enough in his recorded crimes. That such a man should rise to power was the greatest of evils for the nation; still his rise illustrates one good side of English society at the time. In England the poor and ignoble still could rise; on the Continent they had nearly lost all chance. Eadric rose to rank and wealth by his personal talents, talents which no writer denies, though they all paint in strong colours the evil use which he made of them. And he really rose; he did not merely, like many low-born favourites of other princes, exercise a secret influence over a weak master. He was advanced to the highest dignities of the realm; he stood forth in the Great Council of the nation among the foremost of its chiefs; he commanded the armies of his sovereign; and, most alien of all to modern preju-

Rise and
character
of Eadric.

Illustra-
tions sup-
plied by
his ad-
vancement.

¹ We get the surname *Streona* or the *Gainer*, evidently an allusion to his acquired wealth, from Florence, under 1006, and the name of his father under the next year. There were so many Eadrics and Æthelrics that it seems in vain to try to identify any of them. We have seen an Æthelric distinguish himself at Maldon; another, in the same region, lay under suspicions of traitorous dealing with Swend (see Cod. Dipl. iii. 304, 314), and had, not a son, but a tenant, called Eadric. We have a little more chance of finding our Eadric in a Thegn of Archbishop Oswald, to whom he makes a grant in 988 (Cod. Dipl. iii. 241). Of his character there is less doubt. William of Malmesbury gives his portrait (ii. 165) in the same page as the opposite portrait of Ulfoytel, and Florence is roused to unusual declamation whenever he mentions him.

The very remarkable English charter in Cod. Dipl. iii. 314 is fixed to a date between 995 and 1002 by the signatures. Ælfric is already Archbishop (see p. 320); Leofsige is still Ealdorman (see above, p. 342).

pieces, he was allowed to mingle his blood with that of royalty.¹ Now, if a man could thus rise by evil arts, it clearly was not impossible that a good man might also rise in a better way. Instances of either kind were doubtless unusual; the general feeling of the time was strongly aristocratic; still there was no legal or even social hindrance to keep a man from rising out of utter obscurity to the highest places short of kingship. Eadric, like most favourites, seems to have made his way to power through the ruin of an earlier favourite. A man named Wulfgeat² had been for some years the chief adviser of Æthelred. He does not seem to have held any of the highest offices or to have ever risen above Thegn's rank. But he clearly exercised some functions which clothed him with a good deal of power, for, among his other offences, unjust judgements are spoken of.³ Wulfgeat was now, doubtless through the influence of Eadric, deprived of all his offices, and his property was confiscated, a sentence which would seem to imply the authority of a Witenagemót. The sentence may have been a righteous one; but at all events the degradation of Wulfgeat opened the way for the elevation of a worse man than himself. Wulfgeat is at least not described as an open traitor and murderer. Eadric, who had probably been rising in position for some years,⁴ now appears as the reigning favourite.

Fall of
Wulfgeat.

Eadric
the chief
favourite.

¹ He married Æthelred's daughter Eadgyth some time before 1009. Flor. in anno.

² Wulfgeat signs many Charters from the year 986 (Cod. Dipl. iii. 222) onwards, but never with any higher title than "Minister."

³ Florence says, "propter injusta judicia et superba quæ gesserat opera." In a Charter of 1015 (Cod. Dipl. vi. 169), by which his confiscated lands, or part of them, are granted away, his crime is described as that of giving aid and comfort to the King's enemies; "Inimicis Regis se in insidiis socium applicavit, et in facinore inficiendi etiam legis satisfactio ei defecit." The Chronicles mention the fact of his disgrace, without suggesting the cause.

⁴ It is in recording the murder of Ælfhelm that Florence first brings in Eadric's name; the Chronicles do not mention him till next year, when he became Ealdorman; on the other hand William of Malmesbury (ii. 177)

CHAP. V.
Earl Ælf-
helm mur-
dered at
Shrews-
bury.

favourite and the director of all the crimes and treasons of the court. A monstrous crime was now committed. Ælfhelm, a nobleman who had been for some years Earl of a part of Northumberland, probably of Deira,¹ was present, seemingly at the court or at some Gemót, at Shrewsbury. There Eadric received him as a familiar friend, entertained him for some days, and on the third or fourth day took him out to a hunting-party. While others were intent on the sport, the executioner of the town, one Godwine, surnamed Porthund,² whom Eadric had won over by large gifts and promises, started forth from an ambush at a favourable moment, and put the Earl to death.³ The sons of Ælfhelm, Wulfheah and

speaks of Eadric as a chief agent in the massacre of the Danes, and makes him take a personal share in the murder of Gunhild. These statements are in no way improbable, but I thought it better to introduce Eadric only at the point where he first appears in Florence. The first signature which seems likely to be his is in 1001 (Cod. Dipl. iii. 316). Lappenberg (in the original German, 439, note 1. Mr. Thorpe leaves out the passage in his translation, ii. 170) refers to a charter of Eadgar in 970 (Cod. Dipl. iii. 56) as containing the names of Eadric and most of his brothers. It is signed by an Eadric, but it is utterly inconceivable that it should be the same man.

¹ Ælfhelm signs as "Minister" in 985 (Cod. Dipl. vi. 119), as "Dux" in 993 (iii. 264). An earlier signature as "Comes" in 990 (iii. 248) is doubtful. Cf. iii. 253. In 997 (iii. 299) he signs as "Nordanhumbrensiūm Provinciarum Dux."

² "Id est Oppidi Canis." Perhaps Godwine was only a *butcher*, as Lappenberg makes him. This is the more usual mediæval sense of *Carnifex*, but the surname sounds as if he were an official person.

³ I give this story a place in the text with fear and trembling. Did it not rest on the authority of Florence, I should at once cast it aside as legendary. The hunting-party has a very mythical sound, being in fact part of the legend of Eadgar and Ælfthryth. And one might be a little suspicious as to Eadric's position at Shrewsbury. Why should Eadric be more at home there than Ælfhelm? The teller of the tale might almost seem to have looked on Eadric as already Ealdorman of the Mercians, and as therefore naturally called on to receive his Northumbrian brother in one of the chief towns of his government. But for Florence to insert, like William of Malmesbury, a mere piece of a ballad without even the attraction of a miracle, is most unlikely. Florence, as I shall presently show, is not infallible, but of all writers he is the most unromantic. I therefore accept the story, though I do not feel perfect confidence in it.

Ufegeat, were soon after blinded by the King's order at CHAP. V.
 Cookham, a royal seat in Buckinghamshire. Amidst all
 these crimes, Archbishop Ælfric died, and Ælfheah of Ælfheah
Archbishop
of Canter-
bury.
1006.
 Winchester, who was before long to take his place beside
 Dunstan as a canonized saint, succeeded to the metro-
 politan throne.

These events seem to have taken up the earlier part of Scottish
inroad.
1006.
 the year. In the summer a new Danish invasion began,
 and there seems reason to believe that it took place simul-
 taneously, and therefore perhaps in concert, with a Scottish
 inroad.¹ It is now a long time since we have heard of any
 disturbances on the part of Scotland proper. King Ken- Death of
Kenneth.
994.
 neth, the faithful vassal of Eadgar, had died in the year of
 the great invasion of Olaf and Swend. But his son Mal- Accession
of Mal-
colm.
1004.
 colm did not obtain quiet possession of the Scottish Crown
 till ten years later. He was now, it would seem, deter-
 mined to revenge the wrong which he had suffered at the [1000.]
 hands of Æthelred in the devastation of Cumberland. He Malcolm
besieges
Durham.
 is said to have invaded Northumberland and to have laid
 siege to Durham. Waltheof,² the reigning Earl, was old

¹ This story comes from a separate tract by Simeon of Durham on the Earls of the Northumbrians (X. Scriptt. 79). By some strange confusion, it is there put under the year 979, the first year of Æthelred. If it happened at all, it must have been in this year, the only one which suits the position of the King, Bishop, and Earl spoken of. Ealdhun became Bishop in 990, and removed the see to Durham in 995. Malcolm began to reign in 1004; a Northumbrian Earldom became vacant in 1006. This fixes the date. The authority of Simeon is, I think, guaranty enough for the general truth of the story, and the silence of the Chronicles and Florence is not conclusive as to a Northumbrian matter. The story also derives some sort of confirmation from a passage of Fordun (Scot. Hist. iv. 39, p. 683, Gale), which is very vague and confused, but which at least implies warfare of some kind between Malcolm and Uhtred. "Othredum itaque Comitem Anglicum, sed Danis subditum, cujus inter eos simultatis exortæ causam nescio, Cumbriam prædari conantem, receptis prædis, juxta Burgum bello difficili superavit."

² Waltheof had been Earl ever since the banishment of Oslac in 975 (see above, p. 292), but his government must have been dismembered in favour of Ælfhelm. His only signature, as far as I can find, is in 994 (Cod. Dipl. iii. 278).

CHAP. V. and dispirited, and, instead of meeting the invaders, he
 Cowardice of Earl Waltheof. shut himself up in King Ida's castle at Bamborough. But he had a son, Uhtred, whose name we shall often meet in the history of the time, and whose career is a singularly chequered one. When his father failed in his duty, he supplied his place, gathered an army, rescued Durham, and gained a signal victory over the Scots.¹ Towards the city which he thus saved Uhtred stood in a relation which we should have looked for rather in the eighteenth than in the tenth century. He was married to a daughter of Ealdhun, the Bishop who had just removed his see to Durham, and, in the character of episcopal son-in-law, he held large grants of episcopal lands. Uhtred's behaviour gained him the special favour of Æthelred, who—doubtless by the authority of one of the Gemóts of this year—deposed Waltheof from his Earldom, bestowed it on his son, and also added the Earldom of Deira, now vacant by the murder of Ælfhelm.² Uhtred, thus exalted, seems to have had no further need of episcopal leases; for he sent the Bishop's daughter back to her father, honestly returning the estates which he had received with her. He then married the daughter of a rich citizen, whom he held by quite another tenure, that of killing her father's bitter enemy Thurbrand. This he, unfortunately for himself, failed to do, and this failure would seem to have set aside the second marriage also, as we presently find him receiving the hand of King Æthelred's daughter Ælfgifu.³ If all this is authentic—and the genealogical and local detail with which it is given

Victory of his son Uhtred.

He unites both the Northumbrian Earldoms.

His marriages.

¹ The heads of the handsomest of the slain Scots, with their long twisted hair, were exposed on the walls of Durham. They were previously washed by four women, each of whom received a cow for her pains. So at least says Simeon, p. 80.

² So I interpret Simeon's words; "Dedit ei comitatum patris sui, adjungens etiam Eboracensem comitatum."

³ Sim. Dun. p. 80. So J. Wallingford, 546.

seems to stamp it as such—the ties of marriage must have sat quite as lightly on a Northumbrian Earl as ever they did on a Norman Duke. The tale indeed suggests that even the daughters of Bishops, a class whom we should hardly have expected to have been so familiarly spoken of after Dunstan's reforms, may have been sometimes married Danish fashion. But the fact that an Earl did not disdain the daughter of a rich citizen at once shows the importance which some even of the northern English cities—for either York or Durham must be meant—had already attained, and it also shows that no very broad line as yet separated the different classes of society in such matters. The story again marks the ferocious habits of the Danish parts of England. It seems the most natural thing in the world for a man on his marriage to undertake to kill his father-in-law's enemy. We shall find that this engagement of Uhtred to kill Thurbrand was the beginning of a long series of crimes, in short of an hereditary deadly feud, which went on till after the Norman Conquest.

Such was the Scottish inroad and its results. It is wrongly placed, and some of the details may be suspected, but the outline of the story may, I think, be admitted. But of the Danish invasion there is no doubt at all. In the month of July a vast fleet appeared off Sandwich, and Kent and Sussex were ravaged without mercy. Danish invasion of the year 1006. Æthelred for once seems to have seriously thought of personal action against the enemy.¹ He gathered together an army from Mercia and Wessex, which was kept in readiness for an engagement throughout the whole autumn, but nothing came of it. The old causes were still at work, and the enemy, perhaps remembering the reception which they had met with at the hands of Ulfcytel, seem now to have

An English army raised, but in vain.

¹ Florence says, "Cum iis fortiter dimicare statuit ;" but there are no words exactly answering to them in the Chronicles.

CHAP. V. avoided a battle.¹ They plundered here and there, and went backwards and forwards to their ships, till, as winter approached, the English army dispersed, and the King returned to his old quarters at Shrewsbury. There is a vein of bitter sarcasm in the way in which the tale is told in the Chronicles. The writers keenly felt the incapacity of their rulers, and the degradation of their

The Danes
go back to
Wight,
November,
1006.

Great
plundering
expedition
in the
winter of
1006-7.

871.

country. The Danes went back to their "frith-stool"²—their safe asylum, their inviolable sanctuary—in the Isle of Wight. Presently, at Christmas, when no resistance was likely, they went forth to their "ready farm," to the quarters which stood awaiting them, as it were to gather in their crops and to enjoy the fat of their own land.³ That is to say, they went on a plundering expedition which carried them further from their own element than they had ever yet ventured. They marched across Hampshire to Reading, and thence up the valley of the Thames, "doing according to their wont and kindling their beacons"—that is, no doubt, wasting and burning the whole country. They thus dealt with Reading, with Wallingford, with Cholsey. They then plunged into the midst of a region where almost every step is ennobled by memories of the great Ælfred. They passed by his birth-place at Wantage; they passed by Ashdown, where, in his terrible first campaign, victory had for a moment shone on the West-Saxon banners. They then, out of mere bravado, as it would seem, climbed the height which, under the corrupted form of Cuckamsley,⁴ still

¹ So Florence, again without direct support from the Chronicles; "illi cum eo palam configere nullatenus voluerunt."

² See Mr. Earle's note, p. 335.

³ Chron. "And se here com þa ofer þa Martines mæssan to his fryðstole Wihltande, . . . and þa to þam middan wintran eodon him to heora gearwan feorme, út þurh Hamtunscire into Bearrucscire to Readingon." So H. Hunt. M. H. B. 752 D. "Quæ parata erant hilariter comedentes."

⁴ "Cwichelmes hlæw." On the Scirgemót—was it not something more

preserves the name of Cwichelm, one of the pair of West- CHAP. V.
 Saxon Kings who first submitted to baptism. This was 636.
 a spot where, in times of peace, the people of that inland
 shire had held their local assemblies, and some unknown
 seer had ventured on the prediction that, if the Danes ever
 got so far from the sea, they would never see their ships
 again. They climbed the height and soon showed the
 falsehood of the prophecy. They crossed the range of
 hills, and went on to the south-east. At Kennet, now
 Marlborough, an English force at last met them, but it
 was speedily put to flight. They then turned homewards.
 They passed close by the gates of the royal city of Win-
 chester, displaying in triumph to its inhabitants the spoils
 of the inland shires of Wessex, now become the defenceless
 prey of the sea-rovers.¹

This was the most fearful inroad which England had yet seen, one which showed that the parts most remote from the sea were now no more safe from Danish ravages than the exposed coasts of Kent and Sussex. The King kept his Christmas at Shrewsbury, and there the Witan met. All heart and hope seemed to be gone; no one could devise any means of withstanding the force which had now harried every shire in Wessex. Nothing could be thought of but the old device; the broken reed was again to be leaned upon; ambassadors were sent, offering money once more as the price of the cessation of the ravages. The offer was accepted; but the price was naturally again raised; thirty-six thousand pounds was to be paid, and the Danish army was to receive provisions. They were fed during the whole winter at the general cost

Witena-
gemót of
Shrews-
bury.
1006-7.

Tribute
again paid
to the
Danes.
1007.

than a mere Scirgemót?—at Cwichelmeshlæw, see Cod. Dipl. iii. 292.
 The prophecy comes from the Chronicles; it is omitted by Florence.

¹ The Chronicler here becomes very emphatic and eloquent, setting down no doubt what he had seen with his own eyes. Florence, harmonizing eighty or ninety years after, is much briefer.

CHAP. V. of England, and early in the next year the sum of money demanded was paid.

Two years'
respite.
1007-8.

We can never speak or think of these wretched attempts to buy peace without a feeling of shame, and yet, in this case at least, the payment may not have been such utter madness as it appears at first sight. Of course nothing more than a respite was ever obtained; when the Danes had spent the money, they came again for more. And it would seem, from the example of Ulfcytel, that a respite could be as effectually won by a manful, even if not perfectly successful, resistance. Still this payment did gain for the country a breathing-space, when a breathing-space was absolutely needed. We hear nothing of any more invasions for two years, and there was at least an attempt made to spend the interval in useful legislation and in putting the country into a more efficient state of defence. Æthelred and his favourites, as usual, spoiled everything, but we need not attribute their cowardice and incapacity to the whole Witan of England. As far as we can see, the schemes of the Legislature were well considered, and, however humiliating, it may have been absolutely necessary to buy a respite in order to devise any scheme at all. In this reign everything was thwarted by Executive misconduct. Æthelred first laid on his Witan the necessity of consenting to all this degradation, and he then frustrated their endeavours to make such degradation needless for the future.

Eadric
made Eal-
dorman

Meanwhile the reigning favourite attained the height of his greatness. He was made Ealdorman of the Mercians,¹ dishonouring the post once held by the glorious

¹ Chron. Flor. 1007. From this time he signs as *Dux*; hitherto he has been *Minister*. The Charter in Cod. Dipl. vi. 151, which Mr. Kemble assigns to 1004, and does not mark as spurious, cannot be genuine. Here Eadric signs as "*Dux*," but then the King is Æthelred and the Archbishop is

daughter of Ælfred. It was most likely at this time that he received the King's daughter Eadgyth in marriage. We have now to repeat the same comments which we made in the case of Ælfric. That old traitor, after his last treason four years before, now vanishes from history,¹ and his place in every sense seems to be taken by Eadric. He probably succeeded him in his Ealdormanship; he certainly succeeded him in his post of chief traitor. The history of Eadric from this moment is simply a catalogue of treasons as unintelligible as those of his predecessor. Why a man who had just risen to the highest possible pitch of greatness, son-in-law of his sovereign and viceroy of an ancient Kingdom, should immediately ally himself with the enemies of his King and country, is one of those facts which are utterly incomprehensible. But that it is a fact there is no good reason to doubt. Our best authorities for this period, the writers nearest to the time, those least given to exaggeration or romantic embellishment, distinctly assert that it was so, and we have no evidence or reasonable suspicion to the contrary.

CHAP. V.

of the
Mercians.

1007.

1003.

Inexplic-
able trea-
sons of
Eadric.

The next year is one memorable in the annals of our early legislation, and the year which followed it is still more so. The civil functions of the King and his Witan were evidently in full activity during the two years of respite. The Laws of Æthelred form several distinct statutes or collections of clauses, most of which are without date; but, of the few dated ordinances, one belongs to the former of these two years, while another may, on internal evidence, be safely set down as belonging to the same

Legislation
of the years
1008-1009.

Æthelnoth, who did not become Archbishop till 1020, four years after Æthelred's death.

¹ He is never mentioned again, and the Ælfric who signs many charters after this with the title of "Dux" is doubtless the Ælfric who died at Assandun. It is inconceivable that they should be the same man.

CHAP. V.
Laws of
1008.

Laws
against
the slave-
trade.

period. The former statute¹ deals mainly with ecclesiastical matters, but it also contains provisions both of a moral and of a political kind. On these points however we get much more of general exhortations than of really specific enactments. The whole reads like an act of penitence on the part of a repentant nation awakened by misfortune to a sense of national sins. Heathenism is to be cast out, an ordinance which shows what had been the effect of the Danish invasions. Such a precept would have been needless in the days of Ine or Offa. But now, not only were many heathen strangers settled in the land, but we may even believe that some native Englishmen may have fallen off to the worship of the Gods who seemed to be the stronger. Some of the clauses are vague enough. All laws are to be just; every man is to have his rights; all men are to live in peace and friendship—excellent advice, no doubt, but hard to carry out in any time and place, and hardest of all when Æthelred and Eadric were to be the chief administrators of the Law. Punishments are to be mild, death especially is to be sparingly inflicted; Christian and innocent men are not to be sold out of the land, least of all to heathen purchasers.² This prohibition is one which is constantly repeated in the legislation of this age, showing, it would seem, how deeply the evil was felt, and how little legislation availed to remedy it. We must never forget that slavery was fully established throughout England, though the proportion of slaves varied greatly in different parts of the country. The slave class was recruited from two sources. Englishmen were reduced to slavery for various crimes by sentence of law, and the children of such slaves followed the condition of their fathers.

¹ Thorpe, i. 304. Schmid, 220.

² Cap. 2. "And úres hláfordes gersédnes and his witenas is, þæt man cristene menn and unforworhte of earde ne sylle, ne huru on hæðene leóde, ac beorge man geórne, þæt man þá sáwla ne forfare, þa Crist mid his ágenum life gebohte."

Welsh captives taken in war formed another class, and it would seem that the proportion of slaves to freemen was unusually large in the shires on the Welsh border. Slaves of both classes were freely sold to the Danes in Ireland, and the words of the statute seem to imply that the kidnapping of innocent persons was not unknown.¹ Both these practices our present statute endeavours to prevent. The same prohibition was re-enacted under Cnut,² but the practice survived all the laws aimed against it, and it was in full force a few years after the Norman Conquest. Bristol, a city which in much later times acquired or retained a reputation of the same kind,³ was the chief seat of this hateful traffic, and among the good deeds of Wulfstan, the sainted Bishop of Worcester, the vigour with which he preached against it is specially recorded.⁴ The intention in this enactment is as good as it could be, but the enactment is vague, no definite penalty is attached to breaches of the law, and we are not surprised to hear that it had little practical effect. Some of the other precepts are even vaguer. We may sum up the whole by saying that all virtues are to be practised and all vices avoided; all church-dues are to be regularly paid, and all festivals are to be regularly kept, especially the festival of the newest English saint, the martyred King Eadward.⁵ The whole is wound up with a pious and patriotic resolve of real and impressive solemnity. The nation pledges itself to fidelity to God and the King. It will worship one God

¹ This seems to be implied in the word *unforworhte*—in the Latin text (Schmid, 237) *insontem*.

² It occurs in nearly the same words in the Statute of Enham, c. 9, and in the Laws of Cnut, Thorpe, i. 376.

³ See Macaulay, Hist. Eng. i. 337.

⁴ W. Malm. Vit. Wulst. ii. 20 (Ang. Sacr. ii. 258).

⁵ Cap. 16 (Thorpe, i. 308). "And See Eadwardes masse-dæg Witan habbað gecoren, þæt man freólsian sceal ofer eal Engla-land on xv. Kal. Aprilis." Mark the way in which the Witan, as a matter of course, pass an ordinance on this matter, which a century or two later would have been held to be a matter of purely ecclesiastical concern.

CHAP. V. and be true to one royal lord; it will manfully and with one accord defend life and land, and will pray earnestly to God Almighty for his help.¹

The formation of a fleet decreed.

992.

Ordinances against desertion from the land force.

Decrees of Enham,

In all this we see a spirit of real reform and real earnestness thoroughly suited to the time. And, if some of the ordinances of the Witan are somewhat vague and dreamy, we find one at least of a more definite and practical kind. The happy days of Eadgar are to be restored, when yearly, after Easter, the royal fleet of England sailed forth, and when no enemy dared approach the land which it guarded.² Under the wretched advisers of his son this regular order had doubtless been neglected. Ships had sometimes been assembled, but certainly not as a matter of regular yearly course. It is singular how seldom, in dealing with an enemy so essentially maritime, we hear of any attempt at maritime action. The gallant sea-fight of sixteen years earlier³ stands almost alone. But now the good old practice was to be renewed, and the royal fleet was to assemble yearly after Easter.⁴ Nor was the efficiency of the land-force forgotten. It was secured by heavy penalties against deserters. A fine of one hundred and twenty shillings was incurred in ordinary cases; but when the King was present in person, desertion placed the life and estate of the culprit at the royal mercy.⁵ The contributions for the repair of forts and bridges were to be strictly discharged,⁶ and generally everything to do with the defence of the land was to be put on the best possible footing.

The decrees of the undated Council of Enham⁷ are

¹ Capp. 34, 35. "Ealle we scylan ænne God lufian and weorðian, and ænne cristendóm georne healdan, and ælcne hæðendóm mid ealle áweorpan."

"And utan ænne cyne-hláford holdlice healdan; and lif and land samod ealle werian, swá wel swá we betst magan, and God Ealmihtigne inwerdre heortan fultumes biddan."

² Will. Malm. ii. 156.

³ See above, p. 307.

⁴ Cap. 27.

⁵ Cap. 28.

⁶ Cap. 26.

⁷ Thorpe, i. 314. Schmid, 226.

marked as belonging to the same period, by the repetition of nearly the same enactments, often in nearly the same words. They contain much the same moral and religious exhortations, and much the same ordinances for the mustering of the land and sea-force, for the repair of the forts and bridges, for the punishment of deserters, and of those who damage a ship of war. But the most remarkable thing about this statute is that it is made in the name of the Witan only, without any mention of the King.¹ But there is no need to infer that there was in this case any departure from the usual legislative process. The Witan only are mentioned, but the action of the Witan implies the action of the King, just as in many places in the Chronicles, where the King only is mentioned, the action of the King implies the action of the Witan. We may indeed fairly suppose that both these statutes were more distinctly the work of the Witan, and less distinctly the work of the King, than in most other cases. The Laws of Ælfred were the work of the King, which he submitted to the Witan for their approval.² So, we may be sure, was the case with the Laws of the other great Kings who succeeded him. But we may well believe that the Laws of Æthelred were the work of Æthelred only in the sense in which the Great Charter was the work of John. Both statutes breathe the same spirit, a

drawn up
in the
name of
the Witan
only.

¹ It is headed "Be Witena gerædnessan." The statute begins, "Dis sindon þá gerædnessa, þe Engla ræd-gifan gecuran and gecwædan, and geornlice lærdan, þæt man scolde healdan." And many clauses begin, "And witena gerædnes is." Mr. Kemble (ii. 212) remarks, "If it were not for one or two enactments referring to the safety of the royal person, and the dignity of the crown, we might be almost tempted to imagine that the great councillors of state had met, during Æðelred's flight from England, and passed these laws upon their own authority, without the King."

This is possible, and even tempting, but on the whole I think they must belong to the years 1007-9. The great importance given to naval preparations seems distinctly to refer them to this time. After the return of Æthelred from Normandy in 1014 we read of no attempt at naval warfare.

² See above, p. 53.

CHAP. V. spirit widely different from anything likely to come forth from Æthelred or his immediate counsellors. They clearly sprang from the best elements of wisdom that the Great Council of the Nation could still supply. They show a real desire to mend the ways of the nation, to make satisfaction to God and man for the past, and for the future to work manfully alike for national reformation and for the national defence. The whole tone is at once pious and patriotic; and the piety is of a kind which, while it strictly enforces every ecclesiastical observance, by no means forgets the weightier matters of the Law, judgement, mercy, and truth. In all this we can hardly fail to trace the hand of good Archbishop Ælfheah.

The fleet raised by contributions of districts.

A fleet then was to be raised, a fleet such as guarded the land in the days of Ælfred and Eadgar. But how was the fleet to be raised? This question leads us to a most remarkable statement in our authorities, the details of which are puzzling in the highest degree, but as to the general bearing of which there can be no doubt at all.¹ The cost of the fleet was to be borne by the

¹ The Chronicles (1008) have, "Hér behead se Cyng þæt mán sceolde ofer eall Angelcyn scyfu fæstlice wyrcean; þæt is þonne; of þrim hund hidum and of tynum ænne scægð, and of viii hidum helm and byrnan."

So Florence; "Rex Anglorum Ægelredus de cocx cassatis unam trierem, de novem vero loricam et cassidem fieri, et per totam Angliam naves intentè præcepit fabricari." So Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 753 A) and Lappenberg, ii. 170.

But the Worcester Chronicle (Cott. Tib. B. iv.) reads "of þrym hund scipum and x bé tynum ænne scægð." I quote Mr. Earle's note, without confidently pledging myself to his interpretation, further than that I feel sure that the assessment must have been by shires in some shape or other. If anything else were needed to prove it, the bequest of Ælfric so appositely quoted by Mr. Earle, and which I have not scrupled to mention in the text, would alone be enough to prove it.

"In this rating of land for raising a navy, the numbers are so uncomformable to the statistical numbers preserved elsewhere, and so incommensurate with each other, that they must be received with suspicion. All the texts agree, except D [the Worcester Chronicle], which, of all extant texts, is probably the nearest to the source. In the confusion of the text of D, may possibly be found materials for a future emendation.

ation at large, individuals or districts being made to contribute according to their means and extent. In such a state of society, land was of course assumed as the only standard of property on which the assessment could be made. It does not appear that either individuals or districts were called on to make any contributions in money to the royal treasury. They were to contribute in kind, according to a scale laid down by the Witan, in the shape of ships, or of things needful for the ships or their crews. There can be no doubt that, in the reign of Æthelred, this was a much wiser arrangement; money which had to pass through the hands either of the King or of his favourite

“ But, taken at its worst, the annal is rich in interest. We learn the curious fact, that it was incumbent on each of the landed subdivisions, to provide the king with a ship and armour. The government did not levy ship-money, but required each county to find its quota of ships. This would apply as well to the inland districts, as to those on the sea-board. And here we find the explanation of an otherwise inexplicable bequest of good Abp. Ælfric, who died two years before this date. He gave one ship to the folk of Kent, and one to Wiltshire. The will is in Cod. Dipl. 716 [iii. 351]. Doubtless, in each of the cases, the bequest was intended as an alleviation of the heavy imposts under which the people groaned. His gift being to the shire, is an argument that the assessment was by shires. It appears to me probable that each shire had to furnish one ship for every three *Hundreds* contained in the shire. Thus a shire containing thirty Hundreds would have to furnish ten ships. (Accordingly, D. may be right: of þrym hund scipum: ? = of three Hundreds—*Hundertschaften*.) This burden would fall on the whole body of the people, according to their rating. But the wealthy landowners had a special burden besides. He who had property up to or over the extent of ten hides, would have to furnish a *scegyð*—and every thane under ten hides, had to furnish a helmet and breastplate.”

The *scegyð*, according to Mr. Earle and Dr. Schmid, seems to be a smaller kind of vessel. It is a pity that even Florence was so far carried away by the wish to appear classical as to talk about triremes, instead of using words which might express the different kinds of vessels spoken of.

On Mr. Earle's showing, the special imposts laid on the great landowners would exactly answer to the Attic *λειτουργίαι*. But it tells somewhat against his interpretation that both Florence and Henry of Huntingdon follow the reading of the other manuscripts. In any case I must confess that I do not clearly understand about the helm and breastplate.

CHAP. V.
The sys-
tem not a
new one.

995-1005.

The contri-
bution
made by
shires.

This assess-
ment the
origin of
ship-
money.

1634-5.

would most likely not have appeared again in the form of ships. But, though there was every reason for employing or continuing such a system, it is not at all likely that it was a system invented for the nonce. There is evidence to show that a contribution of ships in kind was the ancient custom. In the will of Archbishop Ælfric, which must of course have been drawn up a few years before this time, that Prelate bequeaths a ship to the people of Kent and another to the people of Wiltshire¹—his former flock when he was Bishop of Ramsbury. This gift must have been intended to relieve the people of those shires from some part of their share in this doubtless heavy imposition. It is hardly possible that the bequest can have any other object; one can think of no other motive which could lead an Archbishop or any one else to leave a ship to a county, especially to an inland county. This evidence seems to show that the contribution was made by shires, that each shire had to furnish a certain number of ships, according to its extent, the assessment on individuals or on smaller districts being probably settled in the Scir-gemót. But the same evidence also shows that the principle of an assessment for ships was no novelty introduced by the particular Councils of these two years. It was most likely the old and regular way of raising a fleet, the way in which the great fleets of Ælfred and Eadgar had been raised. But this vote of King Æthelred's Witenagemót does not only look backward; it looks forward. There can be no doubt that, in this ancient way of gathering together a fleet, we have the germ of the famous ship-money of the seventeenth century.² The writs discovered by Noy calling on maritime, and sometimes on inland, counties and places to furnish ships, and the writs

¹ Cod. Dipl. iii. 352.

² On the ship-money see Mr. Bruce's Prefaces to the Calendars of State Papers for 1634-5, pp. xxv. et seqq., and for 1635, pp. x. et seqq.

issued by Charles the First in pursuance of the precedents thus discovered, undoubtedly take their root in the statute of the thirtieth year of King Æthelred. They are the degenerate successors of that great vote of the Witenagemót of 1008, just as that vote was the more lawful successor of earlier votes in the days of England's greatest Kings. There is of course one all-important difference between the two cases. The contributions levied by Charles were levied by an usurping stretch of the royal prerogative; the contributions levied by Ælfred, Eadgar, and Æthelred were granted, in due form of law, by the Great Council of the Nation. But the impost was the same, though the authority by which it was raised was lawful in the one case and unlawful in the other. The earlier writs of ship-money demanded actual ships, just as in the case before us. And there was a call for special attention to the fleet in the days of Charles just as much as there was in the days of Æthelred. To say nothing of the general complications of Europe, the Algerine corsairs, though not quite so formidable as Swend's Danes, inflicted serious damage on English commerce, and sometimes actually landed and plundered on the English and Irish coasts. The objection was to the illegal shape in which the demand came. And the later writs, which, under pretence of a composition for the actual ships, levied a tax by royal authority over the whole country, were a further abuse. Money came into the King's clutches, not only without any lawful right, but without any sort of guaranty that it would be applied to the purposes for which it was ostensibly raised. This was the very evil against which the ancient mode of contributions in kind effectually guarded.

Besides these vigorous preparations at home, there seems some reason to believe that an attempt was made at this time to strengthen England by foreign help. It was evidently felt that the peace bought from the Danes had

Embassy
to Nor-
mandy.
1009!

CHAP. V secured only a breathing-space, that their attacks would soon begin again, and that it was necessary to employ the blessed interval in obtaining support from every possible quarter. It was not unnatural to hope that the marriage of Emma had gained for England a continental ally, and we are told, on secondary but not contemptible authority, that Æthelred now sent to his brother-in-law Duke Richard, asking for both help and counsel.¹ There is nothing unlikely in the statement; but, whatever may have been given by Richard in the way of counsel, it does not appear that a single Norman ship or Norman soldier was sent to the help of England. Hugh, the betrayer of Exeter, is the only recorded contribution which either Norman chivalry or Norman churlhood made to the defence of our shores against the Dane. Nor indeed was there any strong reason why Richard should help his brother-in-law, unless he had taken up the cause as a kind of a Crusade, and had stepped in as a Christian champion against the heathen invaders. But Richard and his subjects were Normans before they were Christians, and all the traditions of Norman policy tended to fraternization with their Danish kinsmen. Such fraternization with the Danes had already caused, certainly a dispute, perhaps an open war, with England. Richard the Good in no way departed from this traditional policy. According to a Norman account, told with great confusion as to time, Richard was, either now or a few years later, actually bound by a treaty with Swend, not only to receive sick and wounded Danes in his dominions, but to allow the spoils of England to be sold in the Norman ports.² This was the old ground of quarrel,

No Norman help given.

Richard's treaty with Swend.

¹ Hen. Hunt. M. H. B. 753 A.

² Will. Gem. v. 7. But this writer makes Swend sail to Northumberland immediately after the massacre in 1002, whereas he did not go thither till 1013. So it is impossible to fix the time to which the treaty should be referred. William may have confounded York and Exeter, or the treaty may belong to a time after Swend's invasion of Northumberland.

but Æthelred was just now not likely to retaliate by another invasion of the Côtentin. And, according to another story, told with equal confusion as to dates, Richard, like his father, did not scruple to accept the help of two heathen Kings of the North in his warfare with his French neighbours.¹ At a later time indeed he could not well refuse shelter in his dominions to his sister with her husband and children; but anything like even an attempt at active interference on the part of Normandy in English affairs was delayed till the reign of his son Robert.

CHAP. V.

Richard keeps aloof from English affairs.

At last the great fleet was gathered together at Sandwich. So great a fleet had never been seen in the reign of any King. No man living had seen such an one, nor was such an one recorded in any book. There the ships were, enough and ready to guard the land against any foe.² And, under Ælfred or Æthelstan, we may be sure that they would have kept the seas clear from every foe, or else would have met the Northmen face to face on their own element. But in the reign of Æthelred domestic treason ruined everything. The fleet raised by such unparalleled efforts was doomed to do no more for England than any other preparations which had been made during this miserable reign. The fleet was ready, but there was discord among the commanders. Eadric, in his own rise, had raised along with him several of his brothers,³ of one of whom,

The fleet assembles at Sandwich. 1009.

¹ Will. Gem. v. 8. Roman de Rou, 6868.

² I here follow the words of the Chronicles almost literally.

³ Florence (1007) gives a list of Eadric's brothers, Brihtric, Ælfric, Goda, Æthelwine, Æthelweard, and Æthelmær, adding that Æthelmær was the father of Wulfnoth, the father of Godwine Earl of the West-Saxons. These brothers often sign Charters, as in 1012 (Cod. Dipl. iii. 355 and vi. 164). Æthelmær, the supposed grandfather of Godwine, seems to have been the King's "discðen" (iii. 346). Eadric also signs as "trywe," Brihtric as "cinges þegen," and possibly their father as "Æðelric ealda trywe." I shall enter more at length into the question of the origin of Godwine at another stage of this work. I will only say that those writers strike me as hasty who identify Wulfnoth the son of Æthelmær with

CHAP. V.
Affairs of
Wulfnoth
and Briht-
ric.

Brihtic, we read a character quite as bad as of Eadric himself.¹ This man, at this time or a little earlier, brought unjust charges to the King, of what nature we are not told, against a leader named Wulfnoth, described as "Child Wulfnoth the South-Saxon."² Orders were given to seize

Wulfnoth the South-Saxon, or who identify either with the father of Godwine. It seems utterly inconceivable that Florence would have spoken of Brihtic and Wulfnoth as he does, if he had conceived them to be uncle and nephew. The Chronicles are silent as to any kindred between Eadric and Godwine, and the description of Wulfnoth the South-Saxon as the father of Godwine, which could not in any case be a contemporary description, is found only in the latest and least authoritative manuscript.

¹ "Homo lubricus, ambitiosus, et superbus," says Florence. The Chronicle simply says that Brihtic accused Wulfnoth, without expressing any judgement as to the truth or falsehood of the accusation, and without giving any character of Brihtic.

² "Wulfnoð cild," "Wulfnoð cild þone Suðseaxscian," say the Chronicles. Now what is "cild" or "Child"? Florence translates it by "Minister," as if it were the same as Thegn; Henry of Huntingdon by "puer nobilis." "Cild" occurs as a title in one other place of the Chronicles, namely in 1074, where it is applied to the younger Eadgar, as if it were the same as Æðeling. So "Ælfricus cognomento Puer" (see above, p. 305) is in English "Ælfric cild." From these passages and from the later use of the word, Child Waters and the like, it is clear that it was a title of dignity, but it would be hard to fix its exact import. On the other hand, we find, oddly enough, an "Ælfric (or possibly Æthelric, the Latin being Ælricus) cild," as also an "Eadwine cniht" among the inferior tenants of Battle Abbey. Chron. de Bello, pp. 14, 15.

This whole matter of Wulfnoth and Brihtic is very obscure and puzzling, but some recent writers, English and French, have been able to see much more clearly into it than I have been able to do by the help of the Chronicles, Florence, and Henry. For instance, Mr. J. A. St. John (Four Conquests, ii. 21) must really have been in the confidence of all the parties concerned. He tells us how

"About the vicious and bewildered king, the earl of Mercia and his brethren clung like the fabled serpents about Laocoon. They were seven in all—Eadric, Brihtic, Elfric, Goda, Ethelwine, Ethelward, and Ethelmere—and between them was incessantly carried on a reckless struggle for pre-eminence. Being all desirous of monopolizing the favour of Ethelred, they plotted against each other, and pursued their designs with relentless vindictiveness."

"Ethelmere, the youngest of the brothers, had a son, Wulfnoth, who for his courage and capacity had been made Childe of the South-Saxons, a post of great honour and distinction. This excited our envy in the breast of his uncle Brihtic, who, in order to compass his overthrow, accused

him; he fled, and persuaded the crews of twenty ships, probably the contingent of his own shire, to flee with him. They presently began to plunder the whole south coast. Brihtic then followed him with eighty ships, thinking to win great fame,² and to bring back Wulfnoth alive or dead. But a violent storm, such as had never before been known, beat his ships to pieces, and dashed them against the shore, where presently Wulfnoth came and burned Brihtic's ships burned by Wulfnoth. A hundred ships were thus lost in one way or another; but these must have been only a small portion of so great an armament. Yet an unaccountable panic seized on all men. In the emphatic words of the Chronicle, "When this was known to the other ships where the King was, how the others had fared, it was as if all were redeless; and the King gat him home, and the Ealdormen and the High-Witan, and forsook the ships thus lightly; and the folk then that were in the ships took the ships eft to London, and let all the nation's toil thus lightly perish, and there was no victory the better that all Angle-kin had hoped for."

Utter dispersion of the fleet.

The fleet was lost just when it was most needed. Æthel-

him of treason to the king. Familiar with the cruel and capricious temper of Ethelred, the young earl effected his escape from London."

The French writer, M. Emile de Bonnechese, is almost more remarkable than Mr. St. John. "De nouvelles défections anéantirent bientôt les forces navales des Anglo-Saxons: un de leurs chefs, nommé Wulnoth, père du fameux comte Godwin, prit la fuite avec vingt vaisseaux. Brihtic, commandant de la flotte, poursuivit le fugitif." (Quatre Conquêtes de l'Angleterre, ii. 17.) No hint whatever why Wulfnoth fled. Presently (ii. 56) we read of "le service que ce Wulnoth rendit au roi Sweyn en lui livrant une partie de la flotte qu'il commandait et en brûlant le reste," events of which the Chronicles preserve no mention whatever. More amazing than all, Wulfnoth is elsewhere described (ii. 54) as "*churl* ou *chef* des Saxons du sud," much as if one were to talk of a man being "Roturier or Duke of Montmorency."

¹ "Ne caperetur, mox fugam iniit," says Florence; Henry of Huntingdon says, "Rex exsulaverat Wlnod."

² Chron. "And þohte þæt he him micles wordes wyrcean sæolde."

CHAP. V.
Renewed
Danish
invasion.
1009.
Thurkill's
fleet.

Canter-
bury and
East-Kent
buy peace.

Efforts of
Æthelred
frustrated
by Eadric.

red, Wulfnoth, and Brihtric had, among them, wrought the utter ruin of their country. As might have been expected, and as evidently was expected, the Danes, when they had spent their money, came again. First came a fleet commanded by an Earl Thurcytel or Thurkill, who plays a great part in the history for about twelve years to come. In the month of August this detachment was followed by a still larger one, under the command of Heming and Eglaf.¹ The treason of Wulfnoth had left neither fleet nor army to resist them. The two fleets met at Sandwich, whither their crews marched to Canterbury and assaulted the city. But the citizens, in concert with the men of East-Kent, bought them off with a payment of three thousand pounds. We may here, as before in East-Anglia,² see the action of the local Witan, and in the distinct mention of the East-Kentish men³ we may see traces of the time when Kent had two Kings, as it even now has two Bishops.⁴ The Danes then went back to their ships, sailed to their old quarters in Wight, and thence ravaged Sussex, Hampshire, and even Berkshire. Æthelred seems now to have plucked up a little heart; the spirit which had been kindled by the vigorous preparations of the last two years had not quite died away. He gathered an army from all England, and placed detachments at various points along the coast. At one time, when the Danes were returning, laden with booty, from one of their plundering expeditions, the King stopped their way with a large force, both Æthelred and his people

¹ The Chronicles seem to join these two fleets into one, under the command of Thurkill, but Florence distinguishes them. The three chiefs are said to have been brothers, and to have come to avenge the blood of a fourth brother slain in one of the earlier expeditions. *Encomium Emmæ*, 7 (ed. Maseres).

² See above, p. 351.

³ "East-Centingas." Chron.

⁴ That is, if Rochester, with the strange Diocese which modern arrangements have attached to it, can any longer be looked upon as a Kentish Bishoprick.

having, so we are told, made up their minds to conquer or die.¹ But, by one of those inexplicable treasons of which we have so many in this reign, Eadric dissuaded the King from the intended battle,² and the Danes were allowed to go back to their ships unmolested. After Martinmas they took up their winter-quarters in the Thames, ravaged Essex and other parts on both sides of the river, and again made several assaults on London. But the old spirit of the city was as strong as ever; every attempt of the Danes was beaten off, to the great loss of the assailants, by the citizens themselves, seemingly without any further help. After Christmas they set out again, and plunged yet further into the heart of the country than they had ever ventured before. They crossed the Chiltern Hills, reached Oxford, and burned the town. They then turned back, as if intending another attack on London. They went on in two divisions, plundering on both sides of the Thames. But hearing that a force was gathered against them in London, the northern division crossed the river at Staines. They then marched through Surrey back to their ships, and passed Lent in repairing them.³

CHAP. V.
November
11, 1009.

Vain at-
tempts of
the Danes
on London.

January,
1010.

Oxford
burned.

Progress
of the
Danish
ravages.
Last year
of resist-
ance.

¹ Flor. 1009. "Rex . . . multis millibus armatorum instructus, et, ut totus erat exercitus, mori vel vincere paratus." But the Chronicles guarantee only the devotion of the army, not that of its leader.

² The Chronicles say only "Ac hit wæs þa þuruh Eadric Ealdorman gelet, swa hit gyt æfre wæs." Florence describes the meaning of the "letting;" "Insidiis et perplexis orationibus ne prælium inirent, sed eâ vice suos hostes abire permitterent, modis omnibus allaboravit."

³ One can hardly conceive that the movements of the Danes were at all regulated by Lent and Easter; yet the language of our authority seems to imply it.

CHAP. V. in the same proportion, the spirit of the English and their capacity for resistance seem to die away. We have now reached a year even more frightful than any that went before it, one which seems to have finally crushed England. It is in this year that we meet with the last resistance that was offered to the invaders during this stage of the war. It was not till four years later, when it was too late, that the national spirit again awoke after the flight and return of Æthelred. After Easter the Danish fleet sailed forth, and this time it attacked East-Anglia. They landed near Ipswich, at a place called Ringmere. But there a hero was waiting for them. In this reign however a hero was commonly accompanied by a traitor to thwart his efforts. This time Ulfcytel was not taken by surprise; he stood ready for them with the whole force of East-Anglia. The battle began, and was for a while doubtful; but before long a Thegn of Danish descent, Thurcytel, surnamed Marehead, set the example of flight, which was followed by the whole army, save only the men of Cambridgeshire,¹ who stood their ground and fought valiantly to the last. The slaughter was great, and, as usual, it fell heavily on the chief men, probably mainly on the *comitatus* of Ulfcytel. There died Æthelstan, a son-in-law of the King,² the noble Thegn Oswig and his son, and Eadwig the brother of Eafic, whose murder was recorded eight years before.³ There too died Wulfric the son of Leof-

April,
1010.

Ulfcytel's
second
battle, at
Ringmere,
May 18.

The battle
lost by the
treachery
of Thur-
cytel.

[1002.]

¹ The "blue-eyed Vandals of Cambridgeshire," says Mr. St. John (ii. 24). The allusions to Byron upon Gibbon is obvious enough, but are the men of Cambridgeshire more blue-eyed than the men of other parts of England?

² "Dæs cynges abum," say the Chronicles, "gener Regis," says Florence. But Henry of Huntingdon calls him "sororius Regis." The word "gener" is certainly often used vaguely for any connexion by marriage. This Æthelstan was probably of the family of Æthelstan the half-King, Æthelwold, Æthelwine, &c. (see above, p. 289). Though so closely connected with the Crown, he seems to have held no higher rank than Thegn. At least I find no Ealdorman of the name, but "Æðelstan minister" signs in 1002 (vi. 143) and 1005 (iii. 339).

³ See above, p. 342.

wine,¹ a man of the stamp of Brihtnoth, at once bountiful to ecclesiastical foundations and true to his country in the day of battle. Through his munificence the great monastery of Burton had been called into being six years earlier.² But it is more to our purpose to note that, on the field of Ringmere, Wulfric, in noble contrast to the spirit which so generally prevailed throughout the land, must have appeared as a volunteer, defending a part of the country which was not his immediate home. He held the rank of Ealdorman³ in one of the shires of

CHAP. V.

[1004.]

¹ Chron. and Flor. Wig. in anno. This Leofwine can hardly be the well-known Earl Leofwine, of whom we shall hear a good deal presently, as, in that case, Wulfric would be the brother of the great Earl Leofric, a connexion in every way improbable. He had, according to the *Chronicle* of Burton (Monasticon, iii. 47), two brothers, Æthelwine or Ælfwine ("Ailwinus" in the Latin), whom the local writer calls "Dux," and Morcere, whom he calls "Comes." "Ailwinus" may be "Æðelwine minister" who signs a charter of 1007 (Cod. Dipl. vi. 155), but that Æthelwine may as easily be the brother of Eadric. The will of Wulfric is extant (Cod. Dipl. vi. 147), containing legacies to his foundation at Burton, to Archbishop Ælfric, to Ealdorman Ælfhelm and his son Ufegeat (see above, p. 356), to one of the many contemporary Æthelrics (see above, p. 354), to Morcere, seemingly his brother, and to his god-daughter, the child of Morcere and Ealdgyth. Mr. Kemble dates the charter in 1001; it seems rather to belong to 1004 or 1005.

On this Wulfric, see the *Burton Annals* in Luard's *Ann. Mon.* 183. Palgrave, *English Commonwealth*, ii. ccxciii. The local writers give him the surname of Spot.

² In 1004, according to both the local *Chronicles*. The Abbot Wulfgeat and his monks came from Winchester. Wulfric was buried within his own monastery, not however in the church, but in the cloister; "in claustrum monasterii sui antedicti sub arcu lapideo juxta ostium ecclesie superioris." (Mon. iii. 47.) His wife Ealhswith, who seems to have died before him, was also buried in the cloister, "juxta ostium ecclesie inferioris." The cloister then had one door to the choir and one to the nave; that is to say, the ritual choir was west of the crossing.

³ Henry of Huntingdon (M.H.B. 753 C) and Bromton (X Scriptt. 888) call him "Consul." The *Burton Chronicle* calls him "illustris et præpotens Consul ac Comes Merciorum, . . . regali propinquus prosapiæ." He could not have been Ealdorman of all Mercia, but he may very well have been local Ealdorman of Derby, or of some other of the shires where his property lay. Sir Francis Palgrave suggests Lancaster. He signs several charters as "Minister," but none, I think, as Ealdorman.

CHAP. V. north-western Mercia, and among his vast possessions, scattered over a large part of Mercia and southern Northumberland, we find none that could have given him any special personal interest in East-Anglian warfare. The Danes kept possession of the battle-field, harried all East-Anglia for three weeks, burned Thetford and Cambridge, and then, partly on horseback and partly in their ships, returned to the Thames. This second burning of Thetford, a town which had already been once [1004.] burned six years before, illustrates, like so many other cases in these wars, the ease with which, when houses were almost wholly built of wood, a town was destroyed and again rebuilt. After a few days they set out again, ravaged Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire, where they had been before, and the districts, hitherto seemingly untouched, of Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire. The state of things which now followed cannot be so well described as in the words of the Chronicles. "And when they were gone to their ships, then should the force go out eft against them if they should land; then went the force home, and when they were east, then man¹ held the force west, and when they were at the south, then was our force at the north. Then bade man all the Witan to the King, and man then should rede how man should guard this land. And though man somewhat red, that stood not so much as one month. And next was there no headman² that force would gather, and ilk fled as he most might, and next *would no shire so much as help other.*" A state of things like this, where the utter corruption of the general government paralyses all national action, gives every encouragement to local and personal selfishness. Such selfishness is at all times rife enough in the ordinary

Further
ravages.

State of
the country
as de-
scribed by
the Chro-
niclers.

¹ "Man," according to the familiar German idiom; it is impossible to modernize the English without it, unless the whole force were to be lost.

² "Heafodman" = Captain, like the German "Hauptmann."

mind. In times of any local pestilence or other misfortune, the districts which are exempt are often inclined to hug themselves in their supposed safety, to be unwilling to take any active exertion for the relief of others, or even to take the needful precautions for their own defence. And, in the times of which we speak, war of all kinds, a Danish invasion, a border war with the Welsh or the Scots, even a civil war among Englishmen, was a scourge at least not more out of the common way than a visitation of cholera or cattle-plague is now. That the Danes should be somewhere in the land had begun to be taken for granted. Each district had thus learned to think only of its own momentary safety, and to be careless about everything else. And this would be especially the case in a country, like England at that time, where the different parts of the Kingdom were still very imperfectly welded together, where the habit of common action was still recent and needed the strong arm of an able King thoroughly to enforce it. Even in this wretched year we may mark three stages of degradation. The first expedition met with real resistance, which, had not Ulfcytel and Wulfrie been betrayed by Thurcytel, would probably have been successful resistance. In the second stage, though it does not appear that a blow was struck after the battle of Ringmere, yet there was at least the show of calling out troops against them. But before the year was out, we hear of a third Danish expedition, to which it does not appear that the least shadow of resistance was offered. At the end of November, the enemy set forth again. They now struck deep into the heart of the country, going much further from their own element than they had ever been before. They marched to Northampton, burned the town, and ravaged the neighbourhood. They then struck southwards, ravaged Wiltshire, and by Midwinter came back to their ships, burning

Northamp-
ton burned,
November,
1010.

CHAP. V. everywhere as they went. Sixteen shires—our authorities
 Extent of stop to reckon them up¹—had now been ravaged with
 the ravages fire and sword. Northumberland and the western and
 up to this northern shires of Mercia were still untouched; and the
 time. western part of Wessex, which had suffered severely in
 former years, seems to have seen no enemy since Swend's
 [1003.] march from Exeter to Salisbury. But the shires of East-
 Anglia (seemingly reckoned as one only), Essex, Middle-
 sex, Hertford, Buckingham, Oxford, Bedford, Cambridge,
 Huntingdon, Northampton, Kent, Surrey, Sussex,² Hamp-
 shire, Wiltshire, and Berkshire, had all been more or less
 harried by the terrible Thurkill. The spirit of the nation
 was now crushed, and its means of defence were utterly
 exhausted.

Peace The Witan met early in the next year. All notion of
 again pur- resistance seems to have been given up, but another at-
 chased. tempt was made to buy off the enemy.³ An embassy
 1011. was sent to the Danes, and another peace was patched
 up. The price was, of course, again raised, and it now
 reached forty-eight thousand pounds. But such a sum

¹ The Chronicles and Florence give the names. William of Malmesbury, though professing to be at least half an Englishman, is too dainty to copy the uncouth names of English shires. "Cum numerentur in Angliâ triginta duo pagi, illi jam sedecim invaserant, quorum nomina propter barbariem linguæ scribere refugio." (ii. 165.)

² The Chronicles reckon Hastings, "Hæstingas," as distinct from Sussex.

³ Chron. and Flor. Wig. in anno. Thietmar, who, for a time, becomes an authority of some value, is amusing in the way in which he brings in English affairs (vii. 26, ap. Pertz, iii. 847). "Audiui sæpius numero, Anglos, ab angelicâ facie, id est pulcrâ, sive quod in angulo istius terræ siti sunt, dictos, ineffabilem miseriam à Sueino, Haraldi filio, immiti Danorum Rege, perpassos esse, et ad id coactos, ut qui prius tributarii erant principis apostolorum Petri ac sancti patris eorum Gregorii spirituales filii, immundis canibus impositum sibi censum quotannis solverent, et maximam regni suimet partem, capto ac interemto habitatore, tunc hosti *fiducialiter* in habitandam inviti relinquerent." This last clause reads more like a description of the settlement of Guthrum than of anything that happened in Swend's time.

~~was not at once forthcoming, and it was not actually~~
~~paid for a full year.~~ This negotiation seems not to have
~~been gained for the country even that temporary repose which~~
~~had been gained by earlier payments; the delay of pay-~~
~~ment may even have provoked the enemy to fresh ravages.~~
 At all events, we read that they went on with their de-
 vastations just the same. And the Chronicles may well say
 that all these evils came upon the land through lack of
 counsel,¹ when we find how Æthelred and Eadric employed
 any momentary respite that the nominal peace may have
 given them. It is the old story of eleven years before, [1000.]
 when Æthelred wasted such time and strength as he had
 left in a needless, and probably unjust, attack upon his
 Cambrian vassal. So now Eadric and his master picked out Eadric
 this time, of all others, for an expedition into Wales. We invades
 are not told what special offence the Welsh princes had Wales, and
 given just at this moment. Border skirmishes were no Saint
 doubt always going on along the Mercian frontier; but David's.
 the present expedition was clearly something much more 1011.
 serious, and it must have had a special cause. It is a
 highly probable conjecture² that, just as in the case of
 Malcolm, the wrath of the English over-lord was aroused
 by a refusal on the part of the Welsh princes to contribute
 to the Danegeld. The expedition, at all events, evidently
 made a deep impression on the Welsh, as it is the only
 warfare with England which their national chroniclers
 think worthy of record for many years before and after-
 wards.³ An English army entered South Wales, under
 the command of Eadric, who, as Ealdorman of the Mer-
 cians, would be the natural commander. With him was

¹ "Ealle þas ungesælga us gelumpon þurh unrædes." Is there an allusion to the name of Æthelred, and is this the origin of his nickname of *Unready*?

² It is suggested by Lappenberg, ii. 175.

³ The last entry is in 991 (see above, p. 313). The next is in 1033. Yet these Chronicles are rather lavish than otherwise of notices of English affairs.

CHAP. V. joined in command another Englishman, whose name is too hopelessly disfigured in the Welsh accounts to be recovered.¹ They marched through the whole of South Wales, as far as that remote Bishoprick whither Saint David had fled from the face of man. There they plundered whatever rude forerunners already existed of the most striking group of buildings in Britain. A force which was capable of accomplishing such a march must have been equally capable of doing some real service against the Danes; but against them not a blow seems to have been struck.

Siege and
capture of
Canter-

But, later in the year, in September, a fearful blow indeed was struck on the other side. Perhaps it was not more fearful, there is some reason to believe that it was in itself less so, than some other events of this dreadful war; but it is clothed with special importance on account of the rank and character of a single sufferer. The Danes now again besieged Canterbury,² and on the twentieth

¹ *Brut y Tywysogion*, 1011. "One year and one thousand and ten was the year of Christ, when Menevia was devastated by the Saxons, to wit, by Entris and Ubia." *Annales Camb.* 1012. "Menevia a Saxonibus vastata est, scilicet Edris et Ubia." *Ann. Menevenses*, 1011 (*Angl. Sacr.* ii. 648). "Menevia vastatur à Saxonibus, scilicet Edrich et Umbrich." Here at last we get Eadric's right name; who Ubia or Umbrich may have been it is vain to guess.

² Of the siege of Canterbury and the martyrdom of Ælfheah—the Alphege of hagiology—we have four distinct accounts. The *Chronicles* of course claim the first place. Then, for this occasion, I may fairly place second the contemporary account of Thietmar (vii. 29. ap. *Pertz.* iii. 849), taken from the lips of an Englishman named Sewald. There is also the life of Ælfheah by Osbern (*Anglia Sacra*, ii. 122), and the narrative of Florence. Simeon simply copies Florence, Henry of Huntingdon follows the *Chronicles* with one or two touches from Florence. The other four narratives may be looked on as independent of each other, except that Florence, when he departs from the *Chronicles*, either copies from Osbern, or, what is more probable, he and Osbern copy from some common source. The narrative in the *Chronicles* (written before 1023) I of course accept unhesitatingly. And I accept the account in Thietmar, which, without contradicting, explains one or two things in the *Chronicles*. It is however odd that a contemporary, though a foreigner, should call Ælfheah by the name of Dunstan, a proof how great was the fame of Dunstan, and how small the fame of Ælfheah, in

day the city was betrayed to them by a traitorous eccle-
 siastic, one Ælfmær, whose life had been saved by Arch-
 bishop Ælfheah on some unrecorded occasion.¹ The Danes

CHAP. V.

bury,
 Sept. 8-29,
 1011.

Christendom generally. The life by Osbern, besides being a pure piece of hagiology in the common style of such lives, contains a number of historical statements which are historically untrue or impossible, and which are valuable only as affording practice in the art of unravelling the component elements of a romantic story. The good sense and knowledge of Florence kept him from repeating any of Osbern's grosser absurdities, but he has introduced several details which cannot be reconciled with the Chronicles, and which are so much the worse for his narrative.

Osbern (ii. 132) makes one of the brothers of Eadric, "lubricus et superbus" like Brihtric, possibly Brihtric himself, offend the nobles of Kent by false accusations and by seizing their property on different pretences. For these misdeeds they kill him. Eadric requires the King to chastise them. Æthelred refuses, affirming the oppressor to have been rightly slain. Eadric then collects ten thousand men, and takes the law into his own hands by invading Kent at their head. Not succeeding in his attempt, he leagues himself with the Danes, describing the nakedness of the land, how the King—at the age of forty-two—was worn out with years, how the princes and people were all sunk in sloth and luxury. King Swend is now dead, and Thurkill commands in his place. So Eadric and Thurkill agree to divide the Kingdom, Eadric to take the East-Angles (seemingly in addition to his Mercian government) and Thurkill the north. Eadric joins in the siege of Canterbury, but presently vanishes from the stage. It would not be difficult to resolve this fable into its component fables. Possibly Eadric's attack on the metropolitan city of England is really borrowed from his capture of the metropolitan city of Wales!

¹ The narrative seems to imply two Ælfmærs, yet the point is not perfectly clear. See Hook, *Lives of Archbishops*, i. 466. The Chronicles seem to distinguish Ælfmær the traitor from Ælfmær the Abbot, and Florence calls the one Abbot and the other Archdeacon. Yet, if Ælfmær the Abbot was a different person from Ælfmær the traitor, why should the Danes let Abbot Ælfmær go free when the Archbishop and the rest were seized? I can only suggest that it is the reverse story to that of Cinna the conspirator and Cinna the poet, and that the Danes mistook one Ælfmær for the other.

Abbot Ælfmær undoubtedly kept his Abbey, and was afterwards raised to the Bishoprick of Sherborne. (Thorn, X Scriptt. 1782. Hist. St. Aug. 23, 24.) Thorn gives two dates to his consecration, 1017 and 1022, and makes him resign his See and return to his Abbey. He appears as Abbot in Charters of 1016-1020 (Cod. Dipl. iv. 9, 10), and in another doubtful Charter of 1023 (iv. 23, 25). He must not be confounded with the contemporary Ælfmær, Bishop of Selsey, who also signs the same Charter. The annals of his own Abbey speak of him with great reverence, and, though ordinary

CHAP. V. seem on this occasion to have been in an unusually merciful mood. This was most likely owing to the influence of Thurkill, who, if he had not already embraced Christianity, certainly did so soon afterwards. The most authentic accounts seem distinctly to exclude the possibility of any general massacre, though the later narratives give us a harrowing picture of slaughter and torture, worked in doubtless from the stock accounts of Danish barbarities elsewhere.¹ That the Cathedral was sacked and burned is a matter of course for which we hardly need any evidence. The number of captives was enormous; the rich would doubtless be ransomed, and the rest sold for slaves. Ælfmær, the Abbot of Saint Augustine's, was, for some unexplained reason, allowed to escape. But Ælfweard the King's Reeve, Leofrune, Abbess of Saint Mildthryth's monastery in Canterbury, and Godwine, Bishop of Rochester,² were all carried away. And with them was

traitors might be advanced, a churchman who had an indirect share in the martyrdom of a saint would hardly meet with favour at the hands of Cnut or of any one else.

¹ The account in the Chronicles is so minute and pathetic that it could hardly have avoided dwelling on the massacre, if any had really taken place. But it speaks wholly of capture, not of slaughter. The shorter narrative of Thietmar seems to imply the same. But Osbern and those who follow him draw a fearful picture of every possible horror, torture of every kind inflicted on men and women, children tossed on spears or crushed under waggons, the whole ending by a systematic *decimation* of the whole city. By decimation is here meant, the execution, not of one in ten, but of nine in ten. This process left alive four monks and eight hundred laymen (Osbern, ii. 136. Florence in anno), the women and children seemingly not being reckoned. If this is any clue to the population of Canterbury at the time, the monks of the two minsters must have been much fewer, and the general population much larger, than one would have expected. The "metropolis of England," as Henry of Huntingdon, using words in their right meanings, calls Canterbury, must have gone down positively as well as relatively since the eleventh century.

These stories cannot be accepted in the teeth of the speaking silence of the Chronicles; but in the capture of the city some lives would doubtless be lost, which would account for the origin of the tale.

² The signatures of Godwine of Rochester seem to extend from 995 to

another captive, whose name has made the capture of CHAP. V.
 Canterbury to stand out more conspicuously than most Captivity
 of the events of this age, Ælfheah, Primate of all of Arch-
 England. Ælfheah was a man of noble birth, who, according to bishop
 Ælfheah.

the standard of piety recognized by his age, had, early in Life of
 Ælfheah.
 life, forsaken, not only his paternal estate, but his widowed Born, 954.
 mother, in order to become a monk. At Deerhurst,¹ at
 Bath, perhaps at Glastonbury, he strove after all monastic
 perfection.

According to some reports, he was first Prior
 of one of the two great Somersetshire monasteries, and
 afterwards Abbot of the other.² But it is more certain Bishop of
 Winchester,
 that he was advanced to the Bishoprick of Winchester, by 984.
 the special favour of Dunstan, at a comparatively early age.
 A few years before the present time he had, as we have Arch-
 bishop of
 seen, been raised to the metropolitan throne. The Arch- Canterbury,
 bishop was now led away captive by the Danes. Accord- 1006.
 ing to the most trustworthy account, he at first promised
 them a ransom,³ in expectation of which they kept him

1046. Mr. Stubbs (Reg. Sac. Angl. 17, 18) seems uncertain whether they
 belong to one man or two. The famous Odo held the see of Bayeux for as
 long a time.

¹ Deerhurst was a small monastery in Gloucestershire, near the greater
 and more famous monastery of Tewkesbury. I mention it here, because
 there are still considerable remains of a church of unusual antiquity, un-
 doubtedly earlier than the Norman Conquest. I fear however that it
 cannot be referred to a date so early as the sojourn of Ælfheah at Deer-
 hurst. There is evidence to show that it was built by Earl Odda in the
 reign of Eadward the Confessor.

² Will. Malms. ii. 184. But see Wharton's note to Osbern, Anglia
 Sacra, ii. 124. Ælfheah's sojourn at Glastonbury seems doubtful. He was
 a monk at Bath, and he probably was Abbot. (Flor. Wig. 984.) It should
 be remembered that Bath was then an independent Abbey. Its union with
 the see of Wells, or rather the temporary translation of the see of Wells
 thither, did not happen till late in the eleventh century.

³ So says Thietmar, and this seems to me to explain both the long de-
 tention of the Archbishop and the excessive indignation of the Danes
 against him when he finally refused to pay. Mr. St. John (ii. 30) need
 not have charged Dr. Lappenberg with misunderstanding Florence and
 the Chronicles. Dr. Lappenberg has not misunderstood anything, but

CHAP. V. seven months in their ships. Meanwhile, not only the ransom of Ælfheah, but the general ransom of all England remained unpaid. The forty-eight thousand pounds, the price of the pretended peace, was still owing. To settle this debt, Ealdorman Eadric—the King is not mentioned—and the other Witan met in full Gemót. The Danes meanwhile lay in the Thames near Greenwich. On the Saturday after Easter the Danes seem to have held some kind of festival, at which they got very drunk on wine lately brought from the south. This was no doubt one advantage of that commerce between the Danes and the Norman ports which Duke Richard and his people found so profitable. The Normans exchanged the wines of Aquitaine for the tribute-money or the slaves of England. In their drunkenness the Danes called on Ælfheah for the payment of the promised ransom. He refused; he would pay nothing; he had sinned in promising to pay; no one should give anything for his life;¹ he offered himself to them to deal with him as they pleased. They then dragged the Archbishop to their husting or place of assembly. Thurkill tried to save him, offering gold and silver, anything save his ship only, for the holy man's life.² But the rest would not hearken, and they began to pelt the Archbishop with stones, logs of wood, and the bones and skulls of oxen,³ the remains of their late feast.

Witena-
gemót at
London,
Easter
(April 13),
1012.

Murder of
Ælfheah.
May 19th,
1012.

Mr. St. John has failed to consult Thietmar. If Dr. Lappenberg is wrong in any point, it is in identifying Ælfmær the traitor with Ælfmær the Abbot.

¹ I adopt this from the Chronicles. There is no contradiction between their version and Thietmar's, but they fill up gaps in each other.

² This intercession of Thurkill is from Thietmar, and it fully agrees with his conduct presently after. Indeed his words in Thietmar imply that he was already a Christian. William of Malmesbury must be uttering mere calumnies when he says (ii. 176), "Turkillus, qui fuerat inceptor ut lapidaretur archiepiscopus."

³ Pelting people with bones at dinner seems to have been an established Danish custom. It is allowed as the punishment of certain minor offences

At last one Thrum, whom Ælfheah had converted, and whom he had confirmed the day before, out of a feeling of pity, clave his head with his battle-axe.¹ The conduct of the Danes both before and afterwards shows that this attack on the Archbishop was a mere sudden outbreak, caused half by drunkenness, half by wrath at the Archbishop's failure to make the promised payment.² Thurkill had not been able to save the Archbishop's life, but it must have been owing to his influence, and to that of any other converts whom Ælfheah had made, that the body was allowed to be taken to London with all reverence. It was there received by two Bishops, Ælfhun of London and Eadnoth of Dorchester, and was buried in Saint Paul's Cathedral.³

by Cnut's "Witherlags Ret." Swend Aggesson, ap. Langebek, iii. 148. See also a mythical story in Saxo, 115.

¹ The Chronicles mention the cleaving of his skull without the name or motive of the actor. These I do not hesitate to supply from Florence. "Drim miles" signs a Charter of Cnut's, in Cod. Dipl. iv. 15. Mr. Kemble marks it as doubtful, but no one would invent a signature of Thrim.

² Florence makes the Danes demand the money of Ælfheah, and say that if it is not paid, he shall be killed on the next Saturday. He refuses, and, angry and drunken, they kill him at once. This is not mentioned in the Chronicle, and Thietmar implies that the time for payment had already come—"transactis tunc omnibus designatis temporibus."

³ "Where," adds the Chronicler, "God shows forth the holy martyr's mighty works." As Ælfheah was killed in 1012, and was translated from London to Canterbury in 1023, we get the date of this entry within nine years.

As the work of Thietmar is less generally accessible than most of my authorities, I transcribe his account of the martyrdom in full.

"Percepi quoque a relatu prædicti hominis Sewaldi factum miserabile ac idcirco memorabile, quod perfida Northmannorum manus, duce ad hoc Thurkilo, Cantuariæ civitatis egregium antistitem, Dunsten nomine, cum cæteris caperent, et vinculis et inediâ ac ineffabili poenâ, more suo nefando, constringerent. Hic humanâ motus fragilitate, pecuniam eis promittit, et ad hanc impetrandam inducias posuit, ut si in his acceptabili redemptione mortem momentaneam evadere nequivisset, semet ipsum gemitibus crebris interim purgaret, hostiam Domino vivam ad immolandum. Transactis tunc omnibus designatis temporibus, vorax picarum caribdis Dei famulum evocat, et sibi promissum celeriter persolvi tributum, minaciter postulat. Et ille ut mitis agnus. 'Præsto sum,' inquit, 'paratus ad omnia, quæ

CHAP. V.
Was Ælf-
heah a
Martyr!

The claim of Ælfheah to the title of martyr was afterwards disputed by his foreign successor Lanfranc. But the honour of the English Archbishop was strongly defended by the more generous Anselm, on the ground that though he did not die for any point of Christian belief yet he died for Christian justice and charity, as refusing to plunder his people in order to obtain a ransom for himself. Ælfheah is not the only one in the list of our ancient martyrs whose technical claim to the honours of martyrdom may fairly be doubted. As in the case of young King Edward, the name was freely bestowed on any good man who died by an unjust death. According to the most trustworthy narrative, Ælfheah, however innocently, brought his death upon himself, by making a promise and then failing to perform it. Hagiographers have of course surrounded him with a halo of sanctity and miracle, and they clearly have exaggerated the evil deeds of his destroyers. But, putting all exaggeration aside, it is easy to see in Ælfheah a thoroughly good and Christian man, one of those men of simple, straightforward, benevolent earnestness, of whom the English Church in that age produced many. He was undoubtedly a Saint, and it seems hard to refuse him the

in me nunc presumitis facere; ac Christi amore, ut suorum merear fieri exemplum servorum, non sum hodie turbatus. Quod vobis mendax videor, non mea voluntas, sed dira efficit mihi egestas. Corpus hoc meum, quod in hoc exilio supra modum dilexi, vobis culpabile offero, et quid de eo faciatis, in vestra esse potestate, cognosco; animam autem meimet peccatricem Creatori omnium, vos non respicientem, supplex committo. Talis loquentem profanorum agmen vallavit, et diversa hunc ad interficiendum arma congerit. Quod cum eorum dux Thurcil à longè vidisset, celeriter accurrens: 'Ne, quæso, sic faciatis! inquit. Aurum et argentum, et omne quod hic habeo vel ullo modo acquirere possum, exceptâ navi solâ, ne in Christum Domini peccetis libenti animo vobis omnibus trado.' Tam dulci affatu infrenata sociorum ira, ferro et saxis durior, non mollitur, sed effuso innocenti sanguine placatur, quem communiter capitibus boum et imbribus lapidum atque lignorum infusione protinus effundunt. Inter tot frementium impetus potitus est coelesti iucunditate, ut signi sequentis efficacia protinus testatur." (Pertz, iii. 849.)

¹ See John of Salisbury's *Life of Anselm*, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 162.

~~the~~ ~~many~~ ~~martyrs~~ ~~of~~
~~death~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~might~~ ~~have~~ ~~avoided~~ ~~by~~ ~~provoking~~ ~~or~~
~~challenging~~ ~~their~~ ~~heathen~~ ~~enemies~~.

He had at least as good a right to it as earlier times, who brought on themselves they might have avoided by provoking or heathen enemies.

Soon after the Archbishop's murder, the forty-eight thousand pounds, the ransom of England, was paid, oaths were sworn, and the Danish fleet dispersed. But Thurkill, whose whole conduct had shown a distinct leaning to Christianity, now entered the English service.¹ As we afterwards find him a zealous Christian, he was doubtless baptized now, if he had not been already baptized by Ælfheah. He brought with him forty-five ships, the crews of which were to receive food and clothing from the King and engaged in return to defend England against every enemy.

The money paid to the Danes.

Thurkill enters the English service. 1012.

Thurkill is a character of much interest, in many points resembling, on a smaller scale, his wonderful countryman Cnut. He entered England on an errand of destruction, and he was gradually won over to be the stoutest defender of the land which he came to ravage. He was not a mere Pallig,² to accept English wealth and honours, and then to go over to the enemy at the first opportunity. When he swore oaths to Æthelred, he honestly devoted himself to the master whose bread he ate. He fought valiantly for England, and his ships for a while were the only refuge where the native King of the English could find shelter.

Character of Thurkill.

¹ The Chronicles and Florence mention the engagement of the forty-five ships without mentioning Thurkill. But as they all represent him as being in the English service the next year, there can be no doubt that this was the time of his change of side. So Encom. Emmæ, ed. Maseres, p. 7. The statement of William of Malmesbury (ti. 176) that Thurkill now received some kind of settlement in East-Anglia (habebat Orientales Anglos suæ voluntati parentes) is in no way improbable in itself, and it falls in curiously with the confused statement of Osbern (see above, p. 385) about the intended partition of England between him and Eadric. But both Osbern and William are very bad authorities for anything relating to Thurkill.

² See above, p. 337.

CHAP. V. If, at a later time, we find him again on the Danish side, it was probably not till death had released him from all personal obligations to his first master, certainly not till English Ealdormen had set him the example of acknowledging the foreign King. The struggle between Eadmund and Cnut might fairly appear to him to be a struggle between two candidates for the English Crown, in which he, as a Dane, might without dishonour take the side of his own countryman.

Swend's
last inva-
sion of
England.
July 1013.

It is probable that the defection of Thurkill hastened the last act of this stage of the Danish invasions. We have now not heard anything of Swend personally for nine years.¹ He had meanwhile been busily engaged in warfare nearer home; but, as regards England, he clearly was only biding his time. On the one hand, the country was thoroughly weakened and disheartened, and seemed to stand ready for him to take possession. On the other hand, as far as material help went, England had gained considerably by the accession of the valiant Thurkill and his followers. To chastise Thurkill, at least to guard against the possible consequences of his conduct, seems to have been the immediate occasion of Swend's greatest and last invasion.² But this motive can have done little more than hasten a purpose which was already fully determined. Swend had no doubt long resolved on the complete conquest of England; but he may well have seen that Thurkill's new position rendered his own presence immediately

¹ Roger of Wendover (i. 441), whose chronology of this time is excessively confused, makes Swend present in England at the death of Ælfheah; on the payment of the tribute, the Danes and English make a league of brotherhood to have one heart and one soul; Swend goes back to Denmark; the massacre of Saint Brice takes place, and then Swend comes again!

² See very distinctly in the *Encomium Emmæ*, p. 7. William of Malmesbury (ii. 176) again slanders Thurkill, making him invite Swend.

ecessary, lest his schemes should be supplanted by the establishment of a rival Danish dynasty in the country.¹ However this may be, Swend set forth, accompanied by his son Cnut, afterwards so famous, and reached England in July. The magnificence of his fleet is described in the most glowing colours.² There is no doubt that, savages as they appear in warfare, the Northern nations of that age had made considerable progress in many of the arts. The fact is abundantly proved by the antiquities of that time and of earlier times which still remain. And the adornment of the ships which were so dear to the heart of every Northern warrior³ was a favourite form of splendour.⁴ There may doubtless be some exaggeration, but there is also doubtless a certain measure of truth, in the account of Swend's splendid fleet, of the birds and dragons on the tops of the masts which showed the way of the wind, of the figures of men and animals in gold, silver, and amber, which formed the signs of the ships, the lions, the bulls, the dolphins, and, what we should hardly have looked for, the centaurs. With this fleet, armed with the whole force of Denmark, Swend crossed the sea, and came first to Sandwich. He then changed his course, and sailed to the mouth of the Humber, to a country among whose population the Danish element was large. The work of so many valiant Kings, of Eadward, of Æthelstan, of Eadmund, was undone in a moment. The North of England was again severed from the West-Saxon monarchy. The

Magnificence of Swend's fleet.

Swend sails up the Humber.

¹ Encom. Em. p. 7. "Turchil . . . magnam partem exercitus tui abducens, viciisse se gaudet : et nunc meridianam partem provincie victor obtinet, ac mavult ibi exsul degens, amicusque factus Anglorum, quos tua manu vicit, gloriari, quam, exercitum reducens, tibi subdi, tibi que victoriam adscribi."

² Encomium Emmæ, pp. 8, 9.

³ Compare the saying of Thurkill just before ; he will give any quantity of gold and silver, anything *except his ship*, to redeem the life of Ælfheah.

⁴ Compare the description of the splendid ship given by Godwine to Harthacnut, Flor. Wig. 1040. Archbishop Ælfrie also leaves King Æthelred his best ship with its accoutrements. Cod. Dipl. iii. 351.

CHAP. V. Danish King sailed up the Trent, pitched his camp at Gainsborough, and all the country on the Danish side of Watling-Street submitted without resistance.¹ Embassies came in from all parts of the North. The Northumbrians submitted under their Earl Uhtred, the King's son. We have seen him acting bravely before and we shall see him acting vigorously again, but just now he did nothing to check the panic, even if he were not the first to be carried away by it.³ Next came the men of Lindesey, and some action what later, the men of the Five Boroughs. The result of the and; of that famous Confederacy had been reckoned among the have most renowned exploits of Eadward and of Eadwig, con- but their mention now shows that they must still be Nat- retained some measure of independence and mutual dis- nexion. Before long, all the population north-east of Watling-Street had acknowledged Swend. From all these districts he took hostages, whom he entrusted to his son Cnut, who was left in command of the fleet. He also required horses and food for his army, and, more than this, contingents of the shires which had submitted had to follow him, willingly or unwillingly, in his onward march. With this force he then crossed Watling-Street, and struck south-west, into the strictly English districts of Mercia, into the one part of England which had as yet escaped ravage, some districts of which could hardly have been seen war since the days of Ælfred. The distinction between

Northumbria,
Lindesey,
and the
Five
Boroughs
submit.
1013.

920-22.
942.

Swend
enters
Mercia;
his horrible
ravages.

¹ This occupation of the North is referred to in the confused narrative of William of Jumièges. See above, p. 372.

² He "soon" (sona) submitted, say the Chronicles; "See above, p. 358." says Florence. William of Malmesbury (ii. 176) makes "Non quod in illorum mentibus genuinus ille calor, et tiens, refriguerit, sed quod princeps eorum Uhtredus dederit."

³ "Sibi lectos auxilios de deditis sumens," says Florence. The most of it; also implied in the words of the Chronicles; "And hē suðweard mid fulre fyrde." *Fyrd* always means the legal military array of an English district; the Danish army is always here.

tween the Danish and English districts was clearly marked in his treatment of the two. Hitherto we have heard of no ravages, but, when he was once within the purely English border,¹ his cruelties became horrible, and they were carried on in the most systematic way. He "wrought the most evil that any host might do;" he is even charged with directly ordering, as his rule of warfare,² the ravage of fields, the burning of towns, the robbery of churches, the slaughter of men, and the rape of women. In this fashion he passed through the country to Oxford, which had already risen from its ashes. The town was saved by speedily submitting and giving hostages. Winchester itself did the like. Swend then marched upon London; but here his success was very different. He had to encounter, not only a valiant resistance, but also ill luck of a different kind.³ Many of his men, unable to find either ford or bridge, were drowned in the Thames. At last he assaulted the city. But the heart of the citizens was as strong as when they beat off both Swend and Olaf Tryggwesson nineteen years before. Not only was King Æthelred, who probably did not add much to the vigour of the defence,⁴ within the city, but the brave Dane Thurkill was there, faithfully discharging the duties of his new

Submission
of Oxford
and Win-
chester.

Swend re-
pulsed
from Lon-
don.

[994.]

¹ The Chronicles distinctly mark the geographical limit of his ravages; "And syððan hé com ofer Wætlinga stræte, hi wrohton þæt mæste yfel þe senig here don mihte."

² Flor. Wig. in anno. "Suis edictum posuit, videlicet, ut agros vastarent," &c.

³ William of Malmesbury (ii. 177) in the middle of his confused narrative of this reign, lavishes a vast amount of fine writing on this siege of London. The drowning of the Danes in the Thames is attributed to the valour of the citizens, with which it clearly had nothing to do. His character of the Londoners does not badly describe that of the English generally; "Laudandi prorsus viri, et quos Mars ipse collatâ non sperneret hastâ si ducem habuissent." But the Londoners had a leader, only William persistently refuses to name any honourable act of Thurkill's.

⁴ Florence ventures to say, "Æthelredus . . . muros viriliter defendit," &c. But this is only a sort of grammatical compliment.

CHAP. V.
992,
994, 1009,
1013.

Swend
marches to
Bath;
the West-
Saxon
Thegns
submit.

Swend is
acknow-
ledged
King.
1013.

service. For the fourth time during this reign, the invaders were beaten back from the walls of the great merchant city, the only resistance that Swend seems to have met with during this fearful march. He now turned back into Wessex, first to Wallingford, then to Bath, destroying, in his former fashion, as he went. At Bath the terrible drama was brought to an end. Æthelmær, Ealdorman of Devonshire, with all the Thegns of the West, came to him, submitted, and gave hostages. Putting the language of the different accounts together, there can be little doubt that this was, or professed to be, a formal act of the Witan of Wessex, deposing Æthelred and raising Swend to the throne. Northumberland had already acknowledged him; and, considering that Swend brought the contingents of the North of England with him, it is possible that there may have even been enough of the chief men of different parts of the kingdom present to give the assembly something like the air of a general Witenagemót. An election of Swend was of course an election under *duresse* in its very harshest shape, and would in no way express the real wishes of the electors. But that some approach to the usual legal formalities were gone through, seems implied in the significant way in which we are told that Swend was now looked upon as "full King" by the whole people.¹ Whether he was crowned is a much more

¹ Chron. "And eall þeodscipe hine hæfde þā for fulne cyning." Flor. "Ab omni Anglorum populo Rex, si jure queat Rex vocari, qui fere cuncta tyrannicè faciebat, et appellabatur et habebatur." Florence's scruple as to the title only confirms the probability of the formal election. So Henry of Huntingdon; "Suain vero ab omni populo habebatur pro Rege." "Suain jam Rex Anglorum." (M. H. B. 754 D.) So among later writers, Roger of Wendover; "Regem Angliæ se jussit appellari" (i. 447); Bromton (X Scriptt. 892), "Swannus jam Rex Anglorum factus." William of Malmesbury (ii. 177) loses himself in fine writing, "totâ jam Angliâ in clientelam illius inclinatâ." The Encomium Emmæ (p. 9) might seem even to hint at a coronation, "jam sæpe dictus Rex totâ Anglorum patriâ est *intronizatus*." But I almost think this looks the other way; had any ceremony of conse-

doubtful matter; the nominal religion of Swend at this moment is a great problem, and we may doubt whether, if the apostate sought the Christian rite, any Prelate would have been found to admit him to it.¹ But that Swend was acknowledged King is perfectly plain. He now went northward to his fleet, seemingly for the purpose of attacking by sea the one city which still held out. But now the spirit even of the Londoners at last gave way; out of sheer fear of the threatened cruelty of the new King, they submitted and gave hostages. By a strange turning about of events,² all England was now in the hands of Swend, while the cause of Æthelred was still maintained by Thurkill and the Danish fleet in the Thames. The monarchy of Cerdic was now confined to the decks of forty-five Scandinavian war-ships. The fleet still lay at Greenwich, the scene of the martyrdom of Ælfheah. Thither, immediately after the submission of London, Æthelred and Thurkill betook themselves. The Lady Emma went over to her brother in Normandy, in company with Ælfsige, Abbot of Peterborough, and she was presently followed by her two young sons, the Æthelings Eadward and Ælfred, with their tutor Ælfhun,

CHAP. V.

London
submits.Æthelred
takes re-
fuge in
Thurkill's
fleet.Emma and
her sons
sent to
Nor-
mandy.
August,
1013.

oration really taken place, the writer would hardly have contented himself with so vague a word as "intronizatus."

¹ That the ecclesiastics kept aloof from Swend might almost be inferred from the Chronicles. Florence mentions only Ealdormen and Thegns, while at the election of Cnut in 1016 the Bishops and Abbots are distinctly mentioned. It confirms this view that William of Malmesbury, though his account is evidently inaccurate in some points, makes Æthelred, before going to Normandy, summon a meeting of Bishops and Abbots, and seemingly of them only, as the only people who adhered to him. "Ab-bates et Episcopus, qui nec in tali necessitate dominum suum deserendum putarent."

² Compare Thucydides' comment (iv. 12) on the battle at Pylos, where the natural parts of the Lacedæmonians and the Athenians were reversed in the like way; *ἐς τοῦτό τε περιέστη ἡ τύχη ὥστε Ἀθηναίους μὲν ἐκ γῆς τε καὶ ταύτης Λακωνικῆς ἀμύνεσθαι ἐκείνους ἐπιπλέοντας, Λακε-δαιμονίους δὲ ἐκ νεῶν τε καὶ ἐς τὴν ἐαυτῶν πολεμίαν οὖσαν ἐπ' Ἀθηναίους ἀποβαίνειν.*

CHAP. V. Bishop of London.¹ Æthelred himself stayed some time longer with the fleet, but at Midwinter he went to the Isle of Wight, the old Danish quarters, which the adhesion of the Danish fleet now made the only portion of his lost realm accessible to the English King.² He there kept the feast of Christmas, and in January he joined his wife and young children in Normandy, where his brother-in-law Duke Richard could hardly refuse him an honourable reception. We seem to be reading the history of James the Second before its time. Eadric, according to some accounts,³ had already gone over with the Lady. Of Æthelred's sons by his first marriage, the gallant Æthelings Æthelstan and Eadwig and their glorious brother Eadmund, we hear nothing. As far as we can see, Swend was the one acknowledged King over the whole realm. If the West-Saxon banner was anywhere displayed, it could have been only on the masts of Thurkill and his sea-rovers. During the whole winter, Swend on his side,

Æthelred
takes re-
fuge in
Normandy.
January,
1014.

¹ The Chronicles distinctly make Emma and her sons go at two different times, and they rather imply that Emma went of her own accord. "*Seo hlæfdige wende þa ofer sæ to hire broðor Ricarde, and Ælfsige Abbod of Burh mid hire; and se cyning sende Ælfun Bisceop mid þam Æðelingum Eadwearde and Ælfrede ofer sæ.*" Florence and William mix up the two things together, but this trait in Emma's character should not be forgotten.

² William of Malmesbury, seemingly to avoid naming Thurkill, confuses everything. He makes Æthelred fly secretly from London to Southampton, and thence to the Isle of Wight. It is there that he holds his synod of Bishops and Abbots (which perhaps grew out of his keeping Christmas in the island), makes a long speech to them, and sends Emma and the children across. Roger of Wendover tells the same story, only without Bishops. William of Jumièges (v. 7) has a romance about Æthelred bringing over some hidden treasures which he kept concealed at Winchester. He fancies that Æthelred was living there, whereas the city was in the power of Swend. William, by his secret flight of Æthelred, at least avoids this absurdity.

³ Roger of Wendover sends him across with a hundred and forty "milites." For a minute and highly coloured version of the whole story, see Mr. St. John, ii. 34. Some of the Bishops must certainly have revealed the confessions both of Æthelred and of Emma.

and Thurkill on his, levied contributions and ravaged the land at pleasure. CHAP. V.

§ 5. *From the Conquest of England by Swend to the Death of Æthelred.* 1013-1016.

This conquest of England by Swend forms an important stage in our history. It was, for the moment at least, the completion of the Danish invasions in their third and final shape of actual Danish conquest. And it was more than this. The Danish Conquest by Swend was, so to speak, the precedent for the Norman Conquest by William. Swend's own possession of England was indeed most short, but he at least held it as long as he lived, and he handed on his mission to his son. The result of Swend's invasion showed that the Crown of England, of England so lately united into a single Kingdom, could, by the event of war, be transferred from the brow of a native sovereign to that of a foreign invader. It was Swend's conquest which made the conquests both of Cnut and of William possible. Cnut's conquest was of course only the completion of Swend's. It was Swend who conceived the idea and who actually for the first time carried it out. That idea was something very different from anything which had been set before the eyes of any earlier Scandinavian invader. Hitherto England had been largely ravaged, and had even been partly occupied. But mere ravages were in their own nature temporary; and the Danes who had settled in England had been gradually brought into a greater or less degree of submission to the English King, into a greater or less degree of amalgamation with the English people. The third stage of the Danish wars, that which had now for a moment accomplished its object, aimed at something of quite another

Importance of Swend's Conquest as introductory to William's Conquest.

Distinction between Swend's Conquest and the earlier Danish invasions.

CHAP. V. kind. It sought, as I have before shown,¹ not only to ravage or even to occupy, but to transfer the Crown of all England, the rule of all its inhabitants, English and Danish alike, into the hands of the King of all Denmark. This object Swend had now accomplished. Succeeding events indeed called for the work to be done over again by his son Cnut. But the example was set; the establishment of a foreign King in England, his recognition, willing or unwilling, by the English nation, were processes which had now become familiar. What Swend had done Cnut might do, and what Cnut had done William might do. Swend now, like William afterwards, was singularly favoured by fortune. But the good luck of the two invaders took quite different shapes. Swend found an incapable prince on the throne, under whom no effective resistance was possible. He was thus enabled to wear out the strength and spirit of the nation by a series of successful, though partial, attacks. He was thus able, at the end of a long series of years, to obtain possession of the whole land without ever having put his forces to the risk of a decisive engagement. William found a hero on the throne; he had therefore, at the very beginning, to stake all his chances on a single battle. But in that single battle England lost her hero, and with him her hope. Swend and William were thus equally lucky, but William ran a far more terrible hazard. Swend is apt to be forgotten in a cursory view of English history, because he is overshadowed by the fame of his son. But Swend was no ordinary man. If greatness consists in mere skill and steadfastness in carrying out an object, irrespective of the moral character of that object, he may even be called a great man.² His pur-

Circum-
stances in
favour of
Swend,

and of
William.

Character
of Swend.

¹ See above, p. 46.

² The epithet of Great however, in Danish annals, belongs not to him but to his grandson Swend Estrithson. Chron. Roskild. ap. Langebek, i. 378.

ose was doubtless fixed from the beginning; but he CHAP. V.
 knew how to bide his time, how to mark and to seize
 his opportunities. Of that species of glory which is won
 by steady and skilful destruction of one's fellow-creatures,
 the glory of an Attila or a Buonaparte, the first Danish
 conqueror of England is entitled to a large share. Of the
 high and generous purposes which well nigh justify the
 ambition of Alexander and of Charles, even of that higher
 craft of the ruler which goes some way to redeem the
 crimes of the Norman Conqueror, we see no trace in his
 career. He was so constantly occupied in aggressive war-
 fare that he had hardly time to show himself as a beneficent
 prince, even in his native Kingdom, and in England, if he
 had his will, he never had the opportunity, of showing
 himself in any light but that of a barbarian destroyer.

Swend then was King—or, as the national writers Death of
 prefer to call him, Tyrant¹—over all England. But it Swend.
 was only for a very short time that he enjoyed his ill- February,
 gotten dominion. Early in the year after his conquest, 1014.
 about the feast of Candlemas, he died at Gainsborough.
 The Danish writers testify to the Christianity of his
 later years. During one of his seasons of adversity,² he His
 was won back again to the faith from which he had religion.
 apostatized; he became a zealous believer, a founder
 of churches and Bishopricks.³ The panegyrist of Queen

¹ See the extract from Florence quoted above. So in 1014. "Suanus tyrannus . . . ad cumulum suæ damnationis," &c. W. Malms. 179. "Quod non esset ille dominus legitimus, sed tyrannus atrocissimus." Rog. Wend. i. 448. "Suanus . . . tyrannus nequissimus . . . quo evidenter apparet ipsum naturalem non esse dominum sed tyrannum." The sense of the word which became familiar in the third century still goes on. See above, p. 152.

² Chron. Erics, ap. Langebek, i. 158. "De regno expulsus . . . tandem ad Christi fidem conversus, baptizatus est [was baptism repeated!] et mox, Deo favente, regnum suum recepit." Chron. Rosk. ib. i. 376. "Tandem Deum cognovit post flagella, quem cœpit quærere eique credere."

³ Saxo, p. 191. "Divinis rebus infatigabilem ultimi temporis curam tri-

CHAP. V. Emma, who writes distinctly in the Danish interest, tells us of his pious end, and of the Christian exhortations, as well as the instructions in the art of government, which he gave to his son Cnut.¹ But the German and English writers seem to know nothing of his piety or of his re-conversion, unless indeed the denial of the claims of one particular Christian saint can be held to be evidence of Christian belief in general. To that denial, we are told, he owed a strange and horrible death. For such an enemy as Swend could hardly be allowed to go out of the world without some accompaniment of wonder and miracle. For once the discreetest of our Latin chroniclers opens his pages for the reception of a legend.² Swend, he tells us, had a special hatred for the martyred King Saint Eadmund, the famous victim of Danish cruelty at an earlier time. He denied him all power and holiness; he demanded a heavy tribute from his renowned church at Bury; he threatened, if it were not paid, to burn the town and the townsfolk, to destroy the minster, and to put the clergy³ to death by torture. All this is perfectly probable;⁴ we can well believe that Swend did thus threaten the church of Bury, and that he died suddenly while preparing to set out to execute his threats. He had held

Legend of
the death
of Swend.

870.

buit," &c. The Roskild Chronicle (Lang. i. 376) makes him bring the English Bishop Bernard from Norway, and so Saxo, 189. Other Bishops and sees, especially Roskild, are spoken of. But Adam of Bremen (ii. 53) seems to attribute all this to Cnut.

¹ Enc. Emm. p. 9. "Cui dum multa de regni gubernaculo, multaque hortaretur de Christianitatis studio, Deo gratias, illi, virorum dignissimo, sceptrum commissit regale."

² See Florence in anno. Cf. W. Malms. 179. The legend is referred to in the Knytlinga Saga, c. 6. "Og Engelskmændene sige, at Kong Edmund den Hellige skal have dræbt ham paa samme Maade, som den hellige Mercurius dræbte Julianus der Frafaldne." The comparison of Swend and Julian is obvious.

³ "Clericos," says Florence; for Bury was then held by secular priests. It was Cnut who first placed monks there.

⁴ It is rendered probable by the special reverence which, as we shall see, Cnut showed to Saint Eadmund.

an assembly of some sort, which probably passed for a Witenagemót of his new realm.¹ He was on his horse, at the head of his army, seemingly on the point of beginning his march from Gainsborough to Bury. He then saw, visible to his eyes only, the holy King coming against him in full harness and with a spear in his hand. "Help," he cried, "fellow-soldiers, Saint Edmund is coming to slay me." The saint then ran him through with his spear, and the Tyrant fell from his horse, and died the same night in horrible torments. This is a legend of the simplest class. If Swend died just as he was about to wreak his sacrilegious wrath on Saint Eadmund's minster, his sudden death would naturally be attributed to the vengeance of Saint Eadmund. The details of the legend are nothing more than a poetical way of expressing the supposed fact. Swend thus ended his days;² as to the fate of his soul our authorities differ widely.³ But the body of the departed Tyrant is said to have been embalmed by an English lady,⁴ and afterwards taken by her at her own cost to Denmark, where it was buried in his own church of Roskild, so long the place of coronation and burial of the Danish Kings.

Swend's
body taken
to Den-
mark.

By the death of Swend his two Kingdoms of Denmark and England became vacant. In Denmark he was succeeded by his son Harold, a prince whose name has passed altogether out of English, and almost out of Danish, history. His reign was short; we are told that he was

¹ Florence calls it "generale placitum," the same name which he applies to the "mycel gemót," the "magnum placitum," of the next year.

² "Swegen geendode his dagas," says the Chronicle, not a very usual expression. It is applied two years afterwards to Æthelred.

³ "Animam remittendo coelestibus," says the Encomium Emmæ (p. 10); "diro corporis cruciatu ad tartara transmissus," says Roger of Wendover (i. 449).

⁴ "Quædam matronarum Anglicarum," says the Encomiast, p. 12. Had Swend found his Eadgyth Swaneahals in England?

CHAP. V? deposed by his subjects on account of his sloth and luxury.¹
 Swend succeeded in Denmark by Harold. 1014. But that he, and not Cnut, was in actual possession of the Danish Crown for some time after their father's death there seems no reason to doubt. As for the English Crown, the crews of the Danish fleet assumed the right of disposing of it, and elected Swend's other son Cnut, who was present at Gainsborough. This prince, afterwards so famous, was now a stripling of about nineteen, and the English, who had bowed to his father, were not inclined to submit to him without a struggle. The Witan, clerical and lay, assembled in due form, and voted, not the election of one of the Æthelings, but the restoration of Æthelred. The words of the formal documents exchanged between the Witan and the absent King peep out in the language of the Chronicles. They sent to say that no lord could be dearer to them than their *cyne-hlaford*—their lord by birth—if he would only rule them more righteously than he did before.² Æthelred then sent over ambassadors, accompanied by the young Eadward, his son by Emma—the nobler offspring of his first marriage are again unnoticed. He promised, by their mouths, to be a good lord to his people, to amend all that had been wrong in his former reign, to forgive all that had been said and done against him, if only they would be faithful and obedient to him. Another version adds the very important engagement that he would submit in all things to the advice of his Witan.³

Inter-
change of
messages
between
Æthelred
and the
Witan.

¹ The Encomiast has more to tell of Harold than other writers. He is not mentioned by Saxo, but his name occurs in the Danish chronicles. According to the Chronicle of Eric (Lang. i. 159) the Danes deposed Harold and elected Cnut, then deposed Cnut, on account of his frequent absences from Denmark, and restored Harold, on whose death Cnut finally succeeded. In the Knytlinga Saga, c. 8, Harold dies before Swend.

² Chron. "And cwædon þat him nan hlaford leofra nære þonne he ge-gecynda hlaford [in the Canterbury Chronicle *cyne-hlaford*], gif he hi rihtlice healdan wolde þonne he ær dyde."

³ Flor. Wig. 1014. "Promittens se . . . in omnibus eorum voluntati consensurum, consiliis acquieturum."

promises were thus exchanged on both sides; Æthelred was again acknowledged, and a decree was passed proclaiming every Danish King an outlaw from England.¹ The expression is singular, unless we look upon it in connexion with the actual acknowledgement of Swend as King. We can hardly conceive a proclamation of outlawry against a foreign invader, if he were a mere foreign invader and nothing else. But if we look on Cnut as a son of the late King and a candidate for the Crown, his outlawry by the opposing party is natural enough. Nor is all this a mere legal subtlety. Cnut then, like William afterwards, was quite aware of the advantage of getting, as far as he could, every legal form on his side.

Outlawry of all Danish Kings. Import of the expression.

In the course of Lent Æthelred came back to England, and met with a joyful reception in London. It was probably in a Gemót held on his return that the King and his Witan proceeded to pass the laws which bear the date of this year.² They relate mainly to ecclesiastical matters, but they contain the same pious and patriotic resolutions as the codes of former years, and they also contain some clauses of a special and remarkable kind. They expressly approve the conduct of certain earlier Assemblies, held under Æthelstan, Eadmund, and Eadgar, which dealt with ecclesiastical and temporal affairs conjointly, and they seem to deplore a separation between the two branches of legislation which had taken place in some later Assemblies.³ It is not very easy to understand the grounds of

Æthelred's return and legislation. Lent, 1014.

Illustration of the relation of Church and State.

¹ Florence says only, "Principes se non amplius Danicum Regem admissuros in Angliam unanimiter sponderunt." But the Chronicles say expressly, "æfre ælcne Deniscne cyning utlah of Englalande gecwædon."

² Thorpe, i. 340. Schmid, p. 242.

³ §§ 36, 37, 38. "And wíse wæran worold-witan þe tó god-cundan riht-lagan worold-laga settan, folce tó steóre, and Criste and cyninge gerihtan þá bóte, þár man swá scolde manega for neóde gewildan tó rihte."

"Ac on þám gemótan, þeah rædlice wurðan on namcūðan stowan, æfter Eádgáres líf-dagum, Cristes lage wanodan, and cyninges lage lytledon."

"And þa man getwæmde, þæt sér wæs gemæne Criste and cyninge on

CHAP. V. this complaint, as in most of the earlier statutes of Æthelred's reign we certainly find both classes of subjects dealt with. But, whatever was the immediate ground of censure, the expression is remarkable, as illustrating a whole class of feelings which were peculiarly strong in that age, and which afterwards lost much of their power. The days of our native Kings were days of a far more complete identification of the Church and the nation than can be found at any time after the Norman Conquest. The nation was intensely religious; the Church was intensely national. The same assemblies and tribunals dealt alike with ecclesiastical and with temporal affairs, without the least idea that either power had intruded upon the proper province of the other. Bishops and Ealdormen were appointed and deposed by the same authority; they sat side by side to judge and to legislate on matters which, after the Norman Conquest, would have been discussed in distinct assemblies. The laws of this year again proclaim that one God and one King is to be loved and obeyed, that heathenism and treason are to be alike eschewed; that all moral duties are to be discharged by one countryman to another. Such is the general summary of the last recorded legislation of Æthelred, conceived in exactly the same spirit as the laws of earlier Assemblies.

Identifi-
cation of
the Church
and the
Nation
before the
Norman
Conquest.

Æthelred
marches
against
Cnut and
drives him
out of
Lindesey.

The nation seemed to be thoroughly kindled with the spirit expressed in the resolutions of the Witan, and for one moment the burst of patriotism extended itself even to the King. For the first and the last time during his long reign, we see Æthelred engaged in righteous and successful warfare.¹ Cnut was still at Gainsborough, where

woroldlicre steóre, and ǣ hit weorð þe wyrse for Gode and for worlde: cume nú to bôte, gif hit God wille." Cf. § 43, where the three Kings are named.

¹ Norwegian tradition (Laing's *Heimskringla*, ii. 9) assigned to Olaf Haraldsson, afterwards Saint Olaf, a share in this campaign on the English side. But the account, like most of the accounts in the sagas, is utterly

he had agreed with the men of Lindesey, a district in CHAP. V. which the Danish element was very large, to furnish him with horses and to join him in a plundering expedition. But before they were ready, Æthelred came up with his full force, and drove Cnut away to his ships. The defeat must have been decisive, as Cnut sailed away altogether from that part of England,¹ and steered his course southwards to Sandwich. There he put on shore the hostages who Cnut mutilates his hostages. had been given to his father from all parts of England, having first subjected them to various mutilations, as the loss of hands, ears, and noses. He then sailed away to Denmark. Æthelred had thus, for once, shown real spirit and vigour, and had done a real service to his country. For a moment England was free from the invaders. But Æthelred ravages Lindesey. the King disgraced his victory by ravaging Lindesey—no doubt in revenge for its submission to Cnut—as cruelly as Swend or Cnut could have done. The land was harried with fire and sword, and the people, as far as might be, were slaughtered. Lastly, the King levied a tribute of Payment to Thurkill's fleet. twenty-one thousand, or, as some say, thirty thousand,² pounds, for the payment of the fleet which still lay at Greenwich. This was Thurkill's fleet, which had so lately been Æthelred's sole refuge, and which still remained in his service.³ Doubtful position of Thurkill. Thurkill's own position at this time is uncertain. We find no further mention of him in the English writers till after the final accession of Cnut, but there is no doubt that he fought on the Danish side in the later warfare between Cnut and Eadmund. The pane-

unintelligible. It seems made up of some confused report of Ulfcytel's battle at Ringmere in 1010, mixed up with Cnut's siege of London in 1016.

¹ The comment of the Chronicler is remarkable; "And wearð þæt earne folc þus beswicen þurh hine." Cnut betrayed them to Æthelred!

² The Chronicles say twenty-one, Florence, thirty thousand. Henry of Huntingdon follows the Chronicles.

³ This appears from the fact that next year Eadric seduced the Danish crews in Æthelred's service.

CHAP. V. gyrist of Queen Emma represents him as being already in intelligence with Cnut, but as seemingly not being very sure of his ground.¹ But this writer's language is not very explicit, and his chronology is so confused that it is not safe to build much on his sole authority. It would not have been astonishing if Thurkill had held that his engagements to Æthelred were cancelled by that prince's flight; but we have seen that he did not act on that principle, and it is equally clear that the Danish fleet which he commanded was distinct from the Danish fleet which chose Cnut King. The death of Æthelred again might fairly be held to cancel his engagements; but, if the Encomiast may be trusted, he was in arms on Cnut's side while Æthelred was still alive. That Thurkill fought for Cnut against Eadmund we may regard as certain; whether he changed sides before the death of Æthelred must remain doubtful. We must weigh the balance between the assertion of a very confused and partial writer and the probability supplied by his former conduct.

Great in-
road of the
sea.

In the same year, as if to illustrate the law that political and natural misfortunes generally come together, the sea—in what part of England we are not told—broke in upon the land, and swallowed up many towns and a countless multitude of people.²

In the next year we again come across the name of the

¹ It will be remembered that, according to this writer, one object of Swend's invasion was to punish the desertion of Thurkill to the English side. We now read (p. 10), "Thurkil . . . terrâ, quod esset optima, inspectâ, maluit conversari vitam fertili patriâ, cum patriensibus [sic] pace confectâ, quam, velut expulsus, demum redire ad propria. Et, ut quidam aiunt, hoc non fecit despiciendo dominum; sed uti, quum, resumptis viribus fratrisque auxilio, repedaret ad debellandum regnum, aut optimates regni consilio suo ad deditionem flecteret, aut, si id parum processisset, dimicantes contra dominum suum hostes incautos a terga cæderet. Cujus rei patet veritas ex eo, quod secum maximam partem militum retinuit, quodque Rex non amplius quam sexaginta naves secum abire permisit."

² Chron. and Flor. in anno. Henry of Huntingdon introduces the fact with the words, "Addidit autem Dominus malis solitis malum insolitum."

infamous Eadric, of whom we have so often heard before, and who now begins a new career of treason, if possible, riler and more fatal than anything that has hitherto been recorded of him. On the other hand we have now reached the beginning of the short and glorious career of the hero Eadmund. This prince appears to have been the third son of Æthelred;¹ one at least of his older brothers seems to have died before him; but, if he was not the eldest of the royal house by birth, he soon won for himself the first place by merit. A great Witenagemót was held this year at Oxford, a city whose renown as the seat of a great University belongs to later times, but which the whole course of these wars shows to have been already a place of considerable importance. Its importance however would seem to have been comparatively recent. The first mention of Oxford in the Chronicles comes about a hundred years before this time, when it appears as one of the chief acquisitions of Eadward the Elder. As it was a frontier town of Mercia and Wessex, we might have expected to find far earlier mention of it; but in more ancient times the now utterly insignificant

CHAP. V.

Great
Witena-
gemót at
Oxford.
1015.First ap-
pearance
of the
Ætheling
EADMUND.History of
Oxford.

910.

912.

¹ The common order of signature among the sons of Æthelred (see Cod. Dipl. iii. 250, 270, 308, 314, 321, 325, 330, 334. vi. 142, 146, 153, 156, 166, 169—I give the pages in which the actual signatures occur) is Æthelstan, Ecgbriht (= Ecgeberht, see p. 289. n. 4), Eadmund, Eadred, Eadwig, Eadgar. Ecgbriht ceases to sign about 1005; so he was probably dead. Æthelstan was doubtless the eldest; once, in 1007 (vi. 159), he signs on behalf of his brothers. His will, witnessed by his brother Eadmund, and containing bequests to him and to Eadwig, is extant (iii. 361); but the date of the instrument and of the testator's death are both uncertain. As to the latter, I have a conjecture, which I shall bring forward in a future note.

Of the sons of Emma, Eadward begins to sign in 1005 (when the pen, even for a cross, must have been guided for him), and Ælfred in 1014 (vi. 169); perhaps 1013, (vi. 166, but that charter is doubtful). But an Ætheling Eadward signs in 1002 (vi. 146), and in a doubtful charter of 990 (iii. 250). This could not be the son of Emma. Possibly there was an Eadward among Æthelred's first family. Of an Ætheling Eadric in 1005 (vi. 153) I can make nothing.

CHAP. V. Bensington¹ seems to have been the chief military post of the frontier, while the now no less insignificant Dorchester was the ecclesiastical capital of a vast diocese, of which the diocese of Oxford, as it stood before recent changes, formed only a small portion. Oxford however was now a place of note; in the new nomenclature of Mercia it gave its name
 1009-1013. to a shire; it had been, as we have seen, taken, retaken, and burned in the wars of Swend; and it must have derived some further importance from the possession of the minster of the local Saint Fritheswyth. That minster, after an unusual number of changes in its foundation, has at last settled down into the twofold office of the cathedral church of the modern diocese and the chapel of the largest college in the University. In this year the town, so lately rebuilt after its burning, was the scene of an Assembly which was evidently attended by a more than usually numerous body of the Wise Men.² Eadric was now guilty of a crime of the same kind as that by which he destroyed Ealdorman Ælfhelm at Shrewsbury nine years before. Among
 1007. the assembled Witan were Sigeferth and Morcere, the sons of Earngrim, two of the chief Thegns in the Danish Con-

¹ See the Chronicles in the years 571 and 777.

² Chron. in anno. "þæt mycel Gemót." Flor. Wig. "Magnum placitum." W. Malma. "Magnum concilium." Yet the one Charter (Cod. Dipl. vi. 167) of this year, and therefore probably of this Gemót, has fewer signatures than many others. This seems to show that it was by no means necessary that a Charter should be signed by all the Witan who were present, and that the average attendance at these Assemblies may have been far larger than we should infer from the signatures only. There are several cases in which whole classes of men sign, or at least witness, in a body, as the Æthelings in the charter quoted in the last page, as the King's housecarles and his chaplains and the citizens of Lincoln witness Bishop Wulfwig's will (Cod. Dipl. iv. 290), as the will of Wulfgyth (Cod. Dipl. iv. 106) is witnessed by King Eadward "and many others." Cf. Cod. Dipl. iv. 168, vi. 206, iv. 297, and especially the charter of 998 (see above, p. 323), which, after many signatures, ends "Nos omnes optimates consensimus."

This Charter of 1015 is a grant to Bishop Beorhtwold (Brihtwold) of Sherborne of lands at Ohilton in Berkshire, formerly held by Wulfgeat, who was disgraced and his property confiscated in 1006.

federacy of the ~~Seven~~ ^{Seven} Boroughs.¹ These chiefs were invited by Eadric to his own quarters,² where he slew them at a banquet. Some of their followers, trying to revenge the death of their lords—the personal tie of the *comitatus* comes out everywhere—took refuge in the tower of the minster. As they could not be dislodged, fire was resorted to, and the tower was burned along with its defenders.³ Æthelred, if he had not ordered this villany, at any rate made himself an accessory after the fact; he confiscated the property of the murdered Thegns, and ordered Ealdgyth, the widow of Sigeferth, to be led as a prisoner to Malmesbury. All this would seem to imply some co-operation on the part of the Witan; it may even imply some real guilt in Eadric's victims; but it in no way lessens the guilt of Eadric and Æthelred. When such things were done, we can understand that men may have thought the rule of the Dane at least not worse than the rule of such Englishmen. A gleam of romance now flashes across the dreary tale of crime and misfortune.⁴ The Ætheling Eadmund had seen the fair widow of Sigeferth, and was smitten with a sudden

CHAP. V.
Murder of
Sigeferth
and Mor-
cere by
Eadric.

Marriage
of Ead-
mund and
Ealdgyth.

¹ The ~~Five~~ ^{Five} Boroughs with the addition of York and Chester. Such at least is the probable conjecture of Lingard, i. 296.

² If Eadric was now restored to his old office of Ealdorman of the Mercians, Oxford would be a town in his government, and the duty of hospitality towards the Witan from other districts would naturally fall upon him. See above, p. 356.

³ These details come from William of Malmesbury (ii. 179), who professes to have read them in the local annals of Saint Fritheswyth's. This burning of the minster seems also to be alluded to in a manifestly spurious charter of Æthelred (Cod. Dipl. iii. 327), where the murder of the Thegns from the Five Boroughs is confounded by the forger with the massacre of Saint Brice. According to this account, the whole church, with its records and books, was burned.

The tower may have been of wood. No part of the existing church is earlier than the twelfth century, and late in the twelfth century. The marriage of Eadmund and his establishment in the North are recorded by the Chronicles and by Florence, but more fully by William of Malmesbury. As his details in no way contradict, but in some degree explain, the account in the Chronicles, I do not scruple to follow him.

... the ... he fol-
... the ... will
... the ...
... the ... himself,
... the ... and dig-
... have come
... at Eald-
... of Sigefrith
... went to the
... of the men of
... a sort of
... which, in the
... led to some
... geography.
... to sail back
... to have

... says William
... the distinct
... afterwards. The
... whether the Wita
... The question
... the time which most
... The Chronicle surely goes too far
... Northumbrian empire
... The Chronicle are noted
... and here take out to his
... as popular
... multiple
... in champion of the
... they escape
... baptism then
... something wonderful
... that says a line

CNUT RETURNS TO ENGLAND.

413

CHAP. V.

proposed to his brother Harold, the reigning King, to make a division of Denmark and to share in a joint expedition to England.¹ The former proposal at least was rejected; whether Harold accompanied his brother to England is less certain;² but in any case he was utterly overshadowed by the fame of Cnut, and he soon vanishes from history altogether. According to the Encomiast, the voyage was undertaken at the express suggestion of Thurkill, who said to Denmark and there made his peace with Cnut.³ At any rate, Cnut set sail with a fleet whose numbers are variously stated at two hundred ships⁴ and at a thousand,⁵ and of whose magnificence we read as brilliant an account as of those of his father. Moreover we are told that the whole of the crews consisted of men of noble birth in the flower of their age.⁶ With this splendid company, Cnut sailed first to Sandwich, and thence steered along the south coast to Fromemouth; that is the harbour of Poole and Wareham, the common mouth of the Dorsetshire Frome and the Dorsetshire Trent. He then harried the shires of Somerset, Dorset, and Wilts, while King Æthelred lay sick at Cosham or Corsham in

Cnut invades England, summer, 1015.

He ravages Wessex.

years' warfare, and who dies of old age when besieged in London; then Eadward, his son by Emma.

¹ Enc. Emmæ, p. 11.

² The presence of Harold is asserted by Thietmar, vii. 28.

³ But the Encomiast's story is so confused that hardly anything can be made of it. He makes the battle of Sherstone take place almost immediately on Cnut's landing. On the other hand, Thietmar does not speak of Thurkill (whom he mentions in his account of the taking of Canterbury, see p. 389), but along with Harold and Cnut he brings a certain Thurgut, whom he kills in a battle in which Eadmund dies also. It is almost impossible to patch up anything out of these stories, except when they fall in with something in better authorities.

⁴ Enc. Emmæ, p. 13.

⁵ Chron. Rosk. ap. Lang. i. 376.

⁶ Enc. Emmæ, p. 13. "In tantâ expeditione nullus inveniebatur servus, nullus ex servo libertus, nullus ignobilis, nullus senili ætate debilis. Omnes enim erant nobiles, omnes plenæ ætatis robore valentes." When nobles were so plentiful, one is tempted to ask in what nobility consisted?

CHAP. V. Wiltshire. The Ætheling Eadmund now began to levy an army in his new principality,¹ and Eadric did the same seemingly in his old Mercian government. But the traitor was still at his old tricks. When the two divisions came together, Eadric made several attempts to destroy his brother-in-law, the result of which was that the two armies separated, leaving the field open to the enemy. Eadric now openly rebelled; he seduced the crews of forty Danish ships in the royal service, those doubtless which were left of Thurkill's fleet,² and joined Cnut. On this the whole of Wessex submitted to the invader, gave hostages, and supplied horses. The Kingdom was now practically divided; but—owing mainly to the romantic marriage and settlement of Eadmund—it was divided in a manner exactly opposite from that which might have been naturally looked for. The Thames is, as usual, the boundary; but the English Ætheling reigns to the north, the Danish King to the south, of that river; the Mercians and Northumbrians are arrayed under the Dragon of Wessex, while the West-Saxons themselves serve, however unwillingly, under the Danish Raven. On these strange terms the war began again, early in the next year, the last year of this long struggle. Just before the Epiphany, Cnut and Eadric, with their mixed force of Danes and West-Saxons, crossed the Thames at Cricklade,³ and entered Mercia. They harried Warwickshire in the usual fashion, ravaging, burning, slaying, as they went. The Ætheling now gathered an army in Mercia, but his troops refused to fight, unless King Æthelred and the Londoners joined them. The

Plans of Eadmund hindered by Eadric.

Eadric rebels, seduces the Danish fleet, and joins Cnut.

Wessex submits to Cnut.

Cnut and Eadric invade Mercia. January, 1016.

Vain attempts of Eadmund to keep an army together.

¹ "Be norðan," say the Chronicles.

² If Thurkill really changed sides before the death of Æthelred, this would seem to be the most likely time.

³ They crossed "cum multo equitatu," says Florence; "mid his here" say the Chronicles, only the Peterborough and Canterbury manuscripts (one of which, Canterbury, omits the words "mid his here") add "clx scipa." Do they mean that Cnut sailed up the Thames? The other reading is distinctly preferable.

army then dispersed in the wonderful way in which armies did disperse in those days. Presently the Ætheling put forth proclamations, summoning every man to join his standard, and denouncing the full penalties of the Law against all who held back.¹ By these means he gathered a larger army, and he then sent to his father, who was in London, praying him to join him with whatever forces he could gather. Æthelred did so, and joined his son's muster with a considerable body of troops. But the old ill luck was at work; the only thing that can be said is that Æthelred was probably dragged to the field from his death-bed. The two divisions had hardly joined when the King discovered, or professed to discover, treacherous plots against his person. These he made an excuse for disbanding the whole army and going back to London. With such a King what could be done? Eadmund retired to Northumberland, the government of his brother-in-law Uhtred. That Earl, it will be remembered, had been, to say the least, somewhat hasty in submitting to Swend, but he now gladly joined Eadmund. [1013.] All men deemed that the Ætheling would raise a third army in Northumberland, and march against Cnut. But he and Uhtred contented themselves with ravaging those Mercian shires which had refused to help them against the Danes,² namely Staffordshire, Shropshire, and Cheshire. Cnut meanwhile went plundering on his side through the shires of Buckingham, Bedford, Huntingdon, Northampton, then by Stamford, through Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire, and on towards York. The ravaging of his country and

Eadmund
and Uhtred
join forces.

Ravages of
the two
armies.

¹ Here is a distinct allusion to the various passages in the Laws of this reign, denouncing penalties on those who fail to attend the royal muster. See above, p. 366.

² The Chronicles mention the ravaging without assigning any cause; Florence adds, "quia adversus Danorum exercitum ad pugnam exire noluerunt." William of Malmesbury sets forth the policy of this severe course at some length.

THE DANISH CONQUEST OF ENGLAND.

v. the danger of his capital caused Uhtred to cease his own ravages and to hasten homewards. He found further resistance useless;¹ he submitted to Cnut and gave hostages. The Dane was now again lord of all England,² save London and whatever extent of country could be held in obedience from London. But now the vengeance of the old feud came upon Uhtred. Thurbrand, whom he had before engaged and omitted to kill, was now allowed to kill him. As Uhtred came to pay his homage to the new prince at a place called Wiheal, a curtain was drawn aside, and armed men stepped forward, who slew the Earl and forty of his companions, among whom one Thurecy son of Navena is specially mentioned.³ This evil deed was attributed to Eadric, the common author of all the Earldom of Northumberland was given by Cnut to a Dane named Eric, who had married his sister Gytha, and had held the government of Norway under Sweyn. But it seems that Eadwulf Cutel, the brother of the murdered Uhtred, either was allowed to hold the northern

¹ "Beah þa for nede," say the Chronicles; William of Malmesbury again expands at some length. Simeon (X Scriptt. p. 80) makes Cnut summon Uhtred to submit, to which summons the Earl returns a reply. But after Æthelred's death he yielded. The chronology is as Uhtred certainly submitted before Æthelred's death, but the fact is are likely enough.

² His extent of territory is well marked by William of Malmesbury. "Commendatis West-Saxonibus, et Merciorum parte quam subducibus suis, ipse in Northanhimbros profectus." London probab-ly protected Essex. We hear nothing of East-Anglia, but see note, p. 39.

³ The murders of Uhtred and Thurecytel are mentioned in the Chronicles; Florence adds the name of Thurbrand. The other details come from the tract of Simeon before quoted. The share of Eadric in the business comes from one version of the Chronicles.

⁴ The Earl thus appointed appears as Yric, Egrius, Iricius, Hyric. Yet Mr. Thorpe not only, in his edition of Florence, invests Eadric with the Earldom, but thrusts—without any sign of interpolation—this erroneous statement into the text of his translation of Lappenberg, whereas, in the original (452), Lappenberg is silent about the fate of Uhtred altogether. On the past history of Eric, see the Saga of Haraldson, c. 139. Laing's Heimskringla, ii. 192.

Yet himself—this (ii. 186), fate of of Olaf

division of the Æthelingdom under the supremacy of Eric, or else succeeded to the whole when Eric was banished. The whole North was thus lost; it was again under Danish rule as completely as it had been before the conquests of Eadward. And, worse still, Wessex was under Danish rule too, and had even anticipated Northumberland in its submission. But London still held out; Cnut therefore hastened to subdue the last stronghold of the national life. Events had followed fast upon one another. Christmas had passed before Cnut crossed the Thames, and Easter had not come when he crossed it again. He hastened with all speed to his fleet in the Dorsetshire haven, and prepared to sail with his whole force against the still faithful city. Eadmund, either now or earlier, hastened to join his father in its defence. Cnut was on his voyage, but he seems to have gone more leisurely than might have been expected after the speed of his march from Yorkshire.² He had only reached Southampton, when tidings were brought of the death of Æthelred. He died, on Saint George's day, probably of the same illness of which we read the year before, and was buried in Saint Paul's Cathedral.

Cnut prepares to attack London.

Death of Æthelred. April 23, 1016.

§ 6. The War of Cnut and Eadmund. 1016.

The throne was now again vacant; England was at last delivered from the worst and weakest of her native Kings. Æthelred had misgoverned his Kingdom till the rule of heat when invaders was felt to be at least not worse than his. He had been deposed and expelled; his Kingdom

¹ The Chronicles seem to place Eadmund's departure for London after the submission of Uhtred, *subjectis omnibus, Edmundum, Florence places it before. William says, "Ita destitit [Cnuto] quam Londonum, per semetra fugitantem, non prius persequi"*
² William adds, "*usque urbem adoriretur.*" *Post Pascha quieuit, ut cum omnibus copiis*

THE DANISH CONQUEST OF ENGLAND.

had been reduced to the decks of a few hired Danish ships. He had been restored; adversity had wrought *no lasting* reform; he had thrown away every advantage, and his Kingdom was again confined within the walls of London. That true-hearted city was once more the bulwark of England, the centre of every patriotic hope, the special object of every hostile attack. Beyond its walls, all was either actually in the hands of the invader or exposed to his power. The Witan of England, Bishops, Abbots, Ealdormen, Thegns, all who were without the walls of London, met in full Gemót, and chose Cnut to the vacant throne.¹ They may well have deemed that further resistance was hopeless, and it should not be forgotten that the full glory of the character of Eadmund had not yet displayed itself. He had shown a gallant spirit, but he had as yet achieved no signal success; the devastation of the three Mercian shires was, to say the least, a very harsh and self-will in the affair of his marriage and settlement in the Five Boroughs. The Assembly therefore passed him by; they chose—perhaps they could hardly help choosing—the Conqueror; they hastened to Southampton, adjured the whole house of Æthelred,² swore Cnut, and received oaths from him that he would be a good and faithful lord to them before God and before the world. But this election did not represent the voice of all England. We now meet with, what is so common in

¹ I cannot but accept this fact, so distinctly asserted by Florence. It is not mentioned in the Chronicles, but I think that their language, when carefully examined, rather gives it a negative confirmation. The Witan who were in London (ealle þa witan þe on Lundene wæron, and se eorl) election of Eadmund is strictly confined to the citizens of London and the burghwara gecuron Eadmund to cyninge). It is only the latest and least authoritative manuscript which attributes his election to the Witan generally (ealle Angelcynnes witan gecuron Eadmund to cinge).

² Flor. Wig. "Omnem progeniem Regis Ægelredi coram illo repudiantes."

German, and so rare in English history, a double election to the Crown. Cnut was chosen at Southampton, but the citizens of London, with such the other Witan as were within the city, held a counter Gemót—probably the earlier of the two in date—and with one voice¹ elected the *Ætheling* Eadmund. Whether he was the eldest surviving son of *Æthelred* is not absolutely certain;² there could be no doubt at all as to his being the worthiest.

Thus, after the long and dreary reign of his father, England had once more at her head a true King of Men, a hero worthy to wield the sword of *Ælfred* and *Æthelstan*.

Short and glorious reign of Eadmund.

The change was instantaneous; after twenty-eight years of unutterable weakness and degradation, we now come to seven months of almost superhuman energy. We see that

all that had been wanting through that long and wretched time was a worthy leader; we see that, without such a leader, the English people were helpless; we see that, under such a leader, even after all that they had gone through, they were still capable of exertions which, twenty or even ten years before, would have driven back the invaders for ever. Everything that could weaken and demoralize a people, everything that could thoroughly weigh down and dishearten them, had fallen on the English nation during the long misgovernment of *Æthelred*. A generation had grown up which had been used from its childhood to see invaders land and ravage at pleasure.

Change wrought by a single worthy leader.

They had seen the noblest local efforts thwarted by incompetence and treachery at head-quarters. They had seen a King and his Councillors incapable of any better device than that of buying off the heathen invader for a moment. They had seen the strength of the nation, while the enemy was preying on its vitals, wasted on distant,

¹ "Unanimi consensu," says Florence.
² See above, p. 409, and below, p. 422.

CHAP. V. bootless, and unrighteous enterprises. They had seen the basest of traitors basking in the smiles of royalty, while the true and valiant defenders of their country were left unrewarded and unnoticed. Such had been the summary of English history for eight and twenty years. But, after all this, the heart of the English people still was sound. The wretched Æthelred had ended his days, and, under his glorious son, hope and courage woke to life again. In the days of the father, one shire would no longer help another; under the son, the most distant parts of the land sent their contingents to the national armies of England. Those armies, instead of flying at the first blow, or disbanding before a blow was struck, could now face the enemy in pitched battle after pitched battle. The standard of England again waved over fields on which her arms were often crowned with victory, and where defeat at least never was disgrace. Once only in the course of his long reign had Æthelred dared to meet a Danish King in open fight. Now, six great battles in seven months showed what Englishmen could still do under a King worthy of his people. The year of the battles of Eadmund is worthy to be placed
871. alongside of the year of the battles of Ælfred. But the traitor still lived to thwart the noblest efforts of the hero; Eadric still remained the evil genius of the reign of Eadmund no less than of the reign of his father.

Eadmund
acknow-
ledged in
Wessex.

Eadmund, surnamed Ironside, was now King in London; but Cnut, by virtue both of his election and of military possession, was King over at least the whole of Wessex, Mercia, and Northumberland. The first act of Eadmund was to go forth from London to attempt to recover the immediate realm of his forefathers, the Kingdom of the West-Saxons. He was at once acknowledged, and English troops flocked to him from all quarters.¹ Meanwhile the

¹ So say the Chronicles and Florence. William of Malmesbury (ii. 180)

CNUT BESIEGES LONDON.

421

CHAP. V.

rival King, having received the homage of the Witan at Southampton, continued his voyage towards London. He halted at Greenwich, and prepared to form the siege of the city. The course of the ships up the river was checked by the bridge—a wooden forerunner, no doubt, of that London Bridge which lasted down to our own times, and which was no doubt made the most of as part of the defences of the city. But Cnut dug a deep ditch to the south of the river, so that the ships evaded the obstacle, and sailed round to the west side of the bridge.¹ He then dug another ditch round that part of the city which was not washed by the Thames, so that London was again hemmed in on every side. But every attempt on the walls was again baffled by the valour of the citizens, and at last Cnut found it more to his interest to check the progress of his rival in the West than to go on with an undertaking which seemed utterly hopeless. He raised the siege, and marched after Eadmund.²

Cnut besieges London; May 7, 1016.

He raises the siege.

The English King was now

puts off the adhesion of Wessex to Eadmund till after the battle of Sherstone.

¹ The first ditch is recorded in the *Chronicles*, which say expressly; “Hi ða duffon áne mycle dic on suð healfe.” William of Malmesbury, though he places the work later, after the battle of Sherstone, speaks of the other ditch which surrounded the city, reaching no doubt from the river to the river again; “fossâ etiam urbem, quâ fluvio Tamensi non alluitur, foris totam cinxerat.” That these are not two descriptions of the same ditch appears from the account in Florence, which takes in both; “in australi parte Tamensis magnam scrobem plagam pontis traxerunt; dein cingentes,” &c. &c. I therefore, with Lappenberg (ii. 188), understand the story as I have told it in the text; the phrase “traxerunt” (so in the *Chronicles* “drogon”) seems to mean that the ships were towed along the new-made canal.

² It is hard to reconcile the authentic narrative of the *Chronicles* and of Florence with the story in Thietmar (vii. 28); and yet that story, manifestly inaccurate in many things, supplies some hints which are not to be despised. According to this version, Harold, Cnut, and “Thurgut” besieged London in July, 1016, with 340 ships, each manned by eighty men. The city was defended by Queen Emma, with her two sons, Æthelstan and Eadmund—Æthelred’s first family are constantly mistaken by foreign

CHAP. V. collecting troops on the borders of the three shires of Somerset, Wilts, and Dorset. The armies met at a point near the confines of all three, but just within the bounds of Somersetshire, on the edge of the high ground covered by the forest of Selwood. The place is spoken of as the Pens, a Celtic name describing the lofty position of the ground, and which is appropriately found in the immediate neighbourhood of considerable vestiges of præ-Teutonic antiquity.¹ Here, on a spot which perhaps had

writers for children of Emma—together with two Bishops and other chiefs. The siege lasted six months; at last the Queen, tired out, asked for peace. The Danes demanded the surrender of the two Æthelings to be put to death, the payment of 15000 pounds of silver as the Queen's ransom, of 12000 pounds as the ransom of the Bishops, the surrender of all the coats of mail in the city, 24000 in number, and of 300 hostages. Emma, after some hesitation, consented to these terms; the Æthelings escaped by night in a little boat, and forthwith began to gather a force for the rescue of the city and of their mother. Eadmund (see above, p. 413) one day followed, in which both Eadmund and Thurgut were killed. The Danes went back to their ships, but, hearing that Æthelstan was coming against them with a Welsh force (*Britanni venientibus*), they raised the siege after killing or mutilating their hostages. Now most of these details are manifestly fabulous; still one or two points are worth examining. Emma may have returned with Æthelred and may now have been in London; she may, during Eadmund's absence, have entered into negotiations with Cnut; her marriage with him next year may even have been the final result of them. Again, Thietmar may have transposed the parts of Eadmund and of Æthelstan. We have no positive evidence whether Æthelstan was alive or dead at this time; but it is quite possible that he was alive, and that he was killed in some skirmish at this time. If this be so, of all praise. Another thing which sounds odd is the word "Britanni," Thietmar never calls the English "Britanni," always "Angli," and he is not likely to have used so unusual a word without some reason. Is it because Eadmund's army came mainly from that part of England where the Welsh blood still lingered? Thietmar's English informant may have used the word "Wealhcygn," and the Bishop of Merseburg may have translated it without much notion of its meaning.

¹ "Pen Pits" and a neighbouring encampment called "Orchard Castle" supply good primæval studies. The latter is not unlike a miniature model of the more renowned hill of Senlac.

BATTLE OF PEN SELWOOD.

been the scene of earlier West-Saxon victories over a CHAP. widely different enemy,¹ did Eadmund, small as had been First battle at Pen Selwood victory Eadmund give battle to his rival. He put his trust in God; he boldly attacked the enemy, and he defeated him. Soon after Midsummer, having collected a larger army, Eadmund again engaged the enemy in another border district, at Sherstone in Wiltshire, just on the marches of Wessex and Mercia.² Of this battle fuller details have been preserved. The eastern shires of Wessex were in the possession of Cnut, so that the men of Hampshire and part of Wiltshire fought on the Danish side. With the Danes also were, not only the traitor Eadric, but at least two other English Ealdormen, Ælfmær, surnamed Darling,³ and Ælfgar the son of Meaw. With Eadmund were the men of Devon, Dorset, and part of Wilts—those of Somersetshire are not mentioned, but they can hardly fail to have been on the English side. At any rate, while

¹ The scene of Eadmund's battle "in loco qui Peonnum vocatur, juxta Gillingaham" (Chron.), Pen Selwood. I am far from being so certain whether the spot "æt Peonnum" (Chron. 658), where Cenwealh defeated the Welsh, is the same, or another of the Pens in the same county. The word *Pen* (head) is a specimen of the Celtic names which still survive in the local nomenclature of this Teutonized, but not purely Teutonic, district.

² I see no reason to doubt that Soeorstan is Sherstone. Mr. Thorpe in his note to his edition of Florence, objects that Sherstone is not, as Florence says, "in Hwicca." But Florence also places the battle of Pen "in Dorsetania," which Pen Selwood is not, though Gillingham is. But both places are so near the confines of their respective shires that military operations may well in both cases have extended beyond the border.

³ So I infer from Florence, who first counts the Wiltshire men among the followers of Cnut, and then, in the speech which he puts into the mouth of Eadric, implies that some at least of them were on the side of Eadmund.

⁴ "Ælmær Dyrling," "Ælmarus Dilectus." Florence alone adds "Algarus filius Meawes," and that Ælfmær and Ælfgar, as well as Eadric, were bound to Eadmund by some special tie—"qui ei auxilio esse debuerant."

CHAP. V. the pure Saxons of Hampshire were arrayed on the side of Cnut, the army of Eadmund must have largely consisted of men of Welsh descent. The King placed his best troops¹—no doubt mainly his own *comitatus*—in front, and the inferior part of his army in the rear. He exhorted them in a speech setting forth the motives obvious on such an occasion, and led them to the place of action. The battle began; the close combat was still carried on, as at Maldon, with the sword.² King Eadmund fought in the front rank, doing the duty alike of a general and of a private soldier.³ The two hosts fought for a whole day, without any material advantage on either side. The next day the fight began again; the English had now a decided advantage, when a new act of treachery on the part of Eadric for a while threw their ranks into disorder. Smiting off the head of a man whose features were much like those of the English King, he held it up, calling on the host of Eadmund to flee.⁴ The English wavered,

¹ Fl. Wig. "Optimum quemque in primam aciem subducit, ceterum exercitum in subsidiis locat." We must remember these tactics when we come to the great fight of Senlac.

² "Lanceis et gladiis pugna geritur." See above, p. 300.

³ "Strenui militis et boni imperatoris officia simul exsequebatur" (so Il. iii. 179, ἀμφοτέρων βασιλεύς τ' ἀγαθός κρατερός τ' αἰχμητής) says Florence, who grows eloquent on Eadmund's exploits. This praise must have been common to every general of those days who deserved to be called a general at all: yet it is often recorded to the special honour of particular commanders, as we shall find it in a very marked way of both Harold and William.

⁴ This incident, not mentioned in the Chronicles, is given by Florence, who is followed by William of Malmesbury. Henry of Huntingdon transfers it to the last fight at Assandun, and leaves out the striking off the other man's head. (The man so killed is called Osmær in Florence; he is only "quidam rusticus" in William of Malmesbury.) Henry gives the speech of Eadric in English, "Flet, Engle, flet, Engle; ded is Edmund." In Florence this is expanded into "Vos Dorsetenses, Domnani, Wiltonienses, amisso capite, præcípites fugite, en domini vestri caput, Eadmundi Basilei, hic teneo manibus; cedite quantocius." The use of the word *Basileus* is remarkable; I do not remember to have ever seen it used elsewhere in ordinary narrative or speech.

BATTLE OF SHERSTONE.

42

CHAP. V.

and some were on the point of flight, when Eadmund, like William at Senlac,¹ tore off his helmet, showed himself alive to his army, hurled a spear at Eadric, but luckily missed the traitor, and slew another soldier who was near him. The English then took heart again; they attacked the Danes with still greater vigour, and kept up the battle till twilight, when the two hosts again separated. Neither side had gained any decided success; neither host, it would seem, kept possession of the place of slaughter.

But, if neither side could claim the formal advantage was clearly on the side of the English.

For in the night Cnut marched stealthily away from his camp, returned to his ships, and again began the siege of London.² Eadmund then crossed into Wessex to gather fresh troops; and now his faithless brother-in-law Eadric came to him, as to his natural lord,³ made his peace with him, and swore oaths of future fidelity.

Eadmund, unconquered by the arms of Cnut, was not proof against the kind of warfare in which Eadric was so skilful. The hero had the weakness again to admit the traitor to his favour and confidence.

At the head of his new troops,⁴ Eadmund

Cnut again besieges London.

Eadmund reconciled with Eadric.

¹ This incident is given only by William of Malmesbury. I trust it is not borrowed from the exploit of the Conqueror.

² That Cnut was present in person at Sherstone is clear from Florence. The *Knytlinga Saga* too (c. 10) makes him present, and gives some details of an encounter between the two Kings in the thick of the battle.

But the details must be legendary, as Eadmund is represented, contrary to universal English practice, as fighting on horseback. Cnut is also called Eadmund's step-father, as if Emma had not only been the mother of Eadmund, but had been already married to Cnut. The *Encomiast* (p. 14) makes Thurkill fight the battle, which with him is a complete Danish victory, in Cnut's absence.

England, but Cnut, looking Earl Eric meanwhile ravages a great part of patriæ"), bids him desist.

³ Fl. Wig. "Ut naturalem dominum [no doubt *cyne-hláford*] requisivit illum."

⁴ Fl. Wig. "Exercitu vice tertiâ congregato." The armies seem always

CHAP. V.

Eadmund wins the third battle and delivers London; he then wins the fourth battle, at Brentford. marched towards London, and, in a third battle, compelled the Danes to raise the siege and return to their ships.¹ Two days after, he fought his fourth battle, at Brentford, where the Danes were again defeated, but many of the English were lost in trying to ford the river without proper precautions. Eadmund now returned to Wessex to gather fresh troops, and meanwhile Cnut sat down, for the third time within these few months, before London. The city was again attacked on every side; but again all attacks by land and by water were in vain. Almighty God, say the Chroniclers, saved the city.

Cnut besieges London in vain the third time.

Great plundering expedition of the Danes.

King Eadmund was now gathering a greater force than ever from all parts of England.² Meanwhile the Danes, finding all their attempts on London fruitless, set out on a plundering expedition on a great scale. They sailed away from London, coasted along the shores of Essex, entered the Orwell, and thence marching across East-Anglia, spread themselves over Mercia, plundering, burning, slaying, according to their wont. Then, gorged with plunder, those who were on foot returned to their ships, and sailed up the Medway, the fierce and swift flowing stream which washed the fair walls of Rochester.³ Those who had horses seem to have reached the same trysting-

to disperse after an action, whether a victory or a defeat. I conceive that the local levies, like the Highlanders ages afterwards, returned home after each battle, while the immediate following of the King or Ealdorman largely remained with him. An invader had the advantage that all his troops were *comitatus*; the Danes had no means of going back to their houses and families.

¹ According to the *Encomiast*, who spreads the events of 1016 over two years, London surrendered to Cnut, and was afterwards recovered by Eadmund.

² *Flor. Wig.* "Rex Eadmundus Ferreum Latus exercitum fortem de totâ Angliâ quarto congregavit."

³ I adopt the description of William of Malmesbury, evidently a fragment of a ballad; "Fluvius ille Rofensem urbem præterfluens, violentus et rapaci gurgite minax, mœnia pulcra lavat."

place by land. But King Eadmund followed them with CHAP. V.
his fourth army, which had evidently been partly at least
levied in Mercia, as he was now north of the Thames.
He crossed the river at Brentford, the scene of his last Fifth battle,
success, followed the Danes into Kent, met them at at Otford ;
Otford, and gained an easy victory. The Danes fled at victory of
with their horses into Sheppey—the corner of England Eadmund.
in which a Danish host had first wintered.¹ The King 855.
pressed on and slew as many as he could; but his evil
genius Eadric now again appeared in his old character.
By the same incomprehensible means of which we have Further
so often heard, Eadmund was hindered from following treasons of
up his victory. The traitor contrived to detain the King Eadric ; he
at Aylesford, and the Danish army was saved from utter saves the
destruction. Danes from
destruction.

The last act of this great drama was now drawing near.
Since the end of April, Eadmund had gathered four
armies; he had fought five pitched battles; he had been
decidedly victorious in four of them, and he had, to say
the least, not been decidedly defeated in any. Never had
the efforts of one man been greater or more successful;
Ælfred himself, in his most hard-fought campaigns, had
not worked for England with a truer heart than his
valiant descendant. Eadmund again marched westward, Eadmund
gathered a fifth army, and prepared for a sixth battle.² collects a
The war, which in the beginning might have almost fifth army
passed for a local struggle, had now become thoroughly from all
national. Cnut had now to fight, not against Wessex England.
but against England, and there is nothing which leads
us to think that he had now any English followers under

¹ See above, p. 46. Was it any confused remembrance of this fact which
led the *Encomiast* (p. 16) to make Cnut's army winter in Sheppey now ?
² The third army fought two battles, one under the walls of London, the
other at Brentford. Florence, in his reckoning, goes by the number of
armies, Henry of Huntingdon by that of battles.

CHAP. V. his banners. Eadmund's new host was gathered from all parts of England, even from districts where the inhabitants were largely of Danish origin. We have no complete enumeration of the shires which sent contingents, but we incidently find that there were among them districts as far apart from each other as Herefordshire, East-Anglia, and Lindesey.¹ The Danes meanwhile sailed along the coast of Essex, and entered the estuary of the Crouch.² There they left their ships, while the army went on a plundering expedition into Mercia, which is spoken of as being more fearful than any that had gone before it. After this, they returned towards their ships, the latter part of their course leading them along the high ground which lies south of the Crouch. Along these heights Eadmund followed them, and at last overtook and engaged them in the sixth and last battle of this wonderful year, the memorable fight of Assandun. At the extremity of the range, two hills of slight positive elevation, but which seem of considerable height in the low country in the East of England, look down on the swampy plain watered by the tidal river. Between the hills and this lowest ground lies a considerable level at an intermediate height, which seems to have been the actual site of the battle. Of the two hills, one still retains the name of Ashington,³ an easy corruption of

*Sixth and
last battle,
at Assan-
dun.*

¹ Florence calls it "*exercitus quem de totâ Angliâ contraxerat.*" The presence of the *Magesætas* from Herefordshire is distinctly mentioned by the same writer; I infer that of the East-Angles and the *Lindesfaras* from the presence of their *Ealdormen*.

² I draw my ideas of the battle from a study of the text of Florence on the spot, compared afterwards with the other authorities. If I am right in placing Assandun where I do, the Danish ships must have been in the Crouch.

³ I have no doubt at all that Assandun is the modern Ashington. The spot exactly answers all the requirements of the narrative in Florence. Another spot which has been proposed is Ashdown, in another part of the county. I suppose its claims rest on the description of the *Encomiast* (17), "*in Æsceneduno loco, quod nos Latini montem fraxinorum possimus inter-*

the ancient form, while the other, in its name of Canew-
don,¹ perhaps preserves the memory of the Danish conqueror himself. On Assandun then, a site marked by entrenchments which are possibly witnesses of that day's fight, possibly of yet earlier warfare, Eadmund drew up his forces in three ranks, and at first seemed disposed to await the attack of the enemy.² The King took the post which immemorial usage fixed for a royal general, between the two ensigns which were displayed over an English army, the golden Dragon, the national ensign of Wessex, and the Standard, seemingly the personal device of the King.³ But Cnut had no mind to attack; probably he wished to avoid a battle altogether, and merely sought to regain his ships with his plunder. At all events he had no mind to attack the English as long as they were posted on a spot where the ground gave them the advantage. Yet the moment was favourable for battle; the Raven fluttered her

CHAP. V.

pretari." But this only shows the French writer's imperfect knowledge of English. *Assandun* is simply, as Florence has it, *mons asini*. Henry of Huntingdon's form *Esesdun* most likely comes from substituting the later genitive *asses* for the older *assan*. The modern form Ashington or Assington is due to the same corruption which has changed *Abbandun* and *Huntandun* into *Abingdon* and *Huntingdon*. The form in *-ing* is so common that it has swallowed up others which are less familiar.

¹ I do not positively assert that Canewdon (*Cánewdon* is a very recent corruption) is really *Cnuteadun*. But the derivation seems probable. The form in *Domesday* (ii. 44), *Carendun*, is clearly corrupt.

² The battle of Assandun in several points suggests that of Senlac, and the details given of Assandun help to explain several questions connected with the later fight. Henry of Huntingdon preserves some very valuable hints; and something, though not much, may be gleaned from the *Encomiast*.

³ *Hen. Hunt.* "Loco regio relicto, quod erat ex more inter draconem et insigne quod vocatur Standard." The full importance of this passage will be seen at a later stage of my history. The West-Saxon Dragon figures prominently in Henry's narrative of the battle of Burford in 752. (See above, p. 39.) In *Saxo* (p. 192) the Dragons become Eagles, but this is clearly only by way of being classical, as one *Tymmo*, a valiant Dane from Zealand, figures as *aquilifer* on the other side, when he surely ought to have been *corvifer*.

CHAP. V. wings, and Thurkill, overjoyed at the auspicious omen, called for immediate action.¹ But Cnut, young as he was, was wary, and would fight only after his own fashion. He gradually led his troops off the hills into the level ground,² that is, the intermediate height between the hills and the swampy plain. The main object of Eadmund was to cut off the Danes from their ships; he had therefore no choice but to leave his strong post and to descend to the lower ground. This movement differed from that of those English troops at Senlac, who, in defiance of Harold's orders, left the hill to pursue the Normans in their real or pretended flight. At Senlac, in contending with horse, the one thing to be done was to keep the strong post against all assaults; at Assandun, English and Danes, using much the same tactics and the same weapons, could meet on equal terms on the level ground. If Eadmund gave up the advantage of his strong position for defence, he gained the advantage of the charge down hill for his attack. He accordingly began the battle with a furious assault upon the Danes; he even forsook the royal post, and charging, sword in hand, in the front rank, burst like a thunderbolt upon the thickest of the enemy.³ The Danes resisted

First attack of the English.

¹ The Danish Raven, according to the story, opened its mouth and fluttered its wings before a victory, but held its wings down before a defeat. The legend is well known; I get it on this occasion from the *Encomiast* (p. 16), whose tale is chiefly valuable as witnessing to the presence of Thurkill.

² Flor. Wig. "Interea Canutus paullatim in sequum locum suos ducit."

³ Ib. "Rex Eadmundus aciem, sicuti instruxerat, velociter movet, et repente signo dato Danos invadit." This seems to imply the charge down hill. In the rhetoric of Henry of Huntingdon we may discern fragments of a ballad which may have rivalled those of Brunanburh and Maldon. "Loco regio relicto . . . cucurrit terribilis in aciem primam. Vibrans igitur gladium electum et brachio juvenis Edmundi dignum, modo fulminis fidit aciem," &c. So Hist. Ram. lxxii. (Gale, i. 433.) "Ædricus . . . videns Ædmundum furore fulmineo hostium aciem penetrantem." Observe that the sword is still the English weapon.

manfully, and the fight was kept up with equal valour, CHAP. V. and with terrible slaughter, on both sides. But on the whole the Danes had the worst, and they were beginning to give way, when Eadric again betrayed his lord and King and all the people of English kin.¹ He was in command of the Magesetas or men of Herefordshire, and of the forces of some other parts of his old Earldom;² at the head of these troops, according to a previous agreement Treachery of Eadric. with Cnut, the English Ealdorman, the brother-in-law of the King, took to flight.³ The battle however was kept up till sunset, and even by the light of the moon;⁴ but, after the flight of Eadric, the English had to maintain the struggle on very unequal terms. All England fought against Cnut; but Cnut had the victory.⁵ The slaughter of the English nobility,⁶ of the chief leaders Slaughter of the English nobility. as he died, by a valiant death, the errors of an earlier stage of his career, ever; the Ealdorman of Lindesey, wiping out, it may be, sword in first English leader who had checked the career of Swend, and who now closed his glorious life by dying, There hand, in fight against the son of his old enemy, redeeming on died one of the many Ælfrics of our story, his more celebrated this hard fought field the infamy which his more celebrated Angelcynnes

¹ Chron. "Eadric... aewāc swa his cynchlaforde and ealre Angelcynnes beode."
² "Mid Magesetan," say the Chronicles; Florence adds, "Cum Magesetensibus, et exercitus parte cui præerat." The Magesetas formed part of his Mercian Ealdormanship.
³ Henry of Huntingdon here brings in the story which he has transferred from Sherston to Amandun. The historian of Ramsey (u. s.) unites the two; "Callidus doli artifex primus cum cohorte sua fugae consuluit; mortuum Edmundum vociferans et affirmans."
⁴ So at least the Eddomian says, p. 18.
⁵ Chron. "per ahte Cnut sige, and gefeht him alle Engla beode." See Mr. Earle's note, p. 340.
⁶ Chron. "And eall Angelcynnes dugud þar weard ferdon."
⁷ See above, p. 317.

CHAP. V. brated namesake had brought upon his very name.¹ The died one personally unknown to us, but a scion of a house than which none has been more famous in our history, the East-Anglian Æthelweard, the son of Æthelwine the Friend of God.² And, in times like these, not only the temporal chiefs, but Bishops and Abbots also, had not scrupled to take the field against the invader. Wulfsige of Ramsey came with the heir of the great house to which his monastery owed so much. Five and twenty years before he had played the churl towards the host of Brihtnoth on its march to Maldon.³ Like Godwine of Lindesey, long years of national wretchedness had brought him to a more patriotic frame of mind, and he now, in his old age, came to give to his King and country such help as his years and calling allowed him. Eadnoth of Dorchester,⁴ once Provost of the same church, came, either through love of his old companions or in the train of Godwine and the valiant men of his own diocese. These holy men, we are told, came only to pray and not to fight,⁵ and in the case of the aged Wulfsige, we may well believe that it was so. But we cannot forget that other English Prelates, before and after, did not shrink from wearing weapons and commanding armies. We have seen that, in this age, Archbishop Ælfric not only bequeathed ships to his Dioceses, but personally commanded fleets,⁶ and it may well be that the arm of Eadnoth, if not that of Wulfsige, was found as

¹ See above, p. 305.

² See above, p. 289.

³ See above, p. 297.

⁴ Florence, by an odd forestalling, calls him "Lindicolinensis."

⁵ "Qui ad exorandum Deum pro milite bellum agente convenerant," says Florence. So the Ramsey historian (lxxii.); "Qui, cum multis aliis religiosis personis, juxta morem Anglorum veterem, ibidem convenerant, non armis, sed orationum suppetiis, pugnantem exercitum juvaturi." Yet I confess that the calm way in which the Chronicles reckon the Prelates among the slain alongside of the Ealdormen looks to me the other way.

⁶ See above, pp. 307, 370.

strong as those of Ealhstan in an earlier, and of Ealdred in a later, generation.¹ At all events, whether they came to pray or to fight, the Prelates met with no more mercy from the Danish sword than the lay chieftains. At last, under cover of night, the King and the remnant of his army escaped; Eadmund Ironside, for the first time in this year of battles, was a fugitive. The Danes hardly ventured to pursue; but they kept possession of the place of slaughter. They tarried on the field all night; in the morning they buried their own dead; they collected the spoils of the slain English, and left their corpses to the fowls of the air and to the beasts of the land.² They then went to their ships and sailed towards London,³ probably with the intention of beginning the siege a fourth time. When they were gone, some of the scattered English ventured to return and to carry off the bodies of the slain leaders. Æthelweard and Wulfsige found an honourable grave in their own church at Ramsey; the body of Eadnoth reposed in the rival minster of Ely, the resting-place of Brihtnoth.⁴

¹ Ealhstan, Bishop of Sherborne, fills a prominent place in the wars of the ninth century. See the Chronicles in the years 823, 845. (Cf. 871 and Will. Malm. ii. 131, for other fighting Prelates of that age.) Of Ealdred's exploits, mostly unlucky, we shall hear much in the course of the next fifty years. Another warrior Bishop will be found in the Chronicles under the year 1056.

² Enc. Emm. p. 18.

³ Enc. Emm. "*Londoniam repetentes, saniora sibi quærunt consilia.*" I do not fully understand these last words; but it is impossible to believe, with Henry of Huntingdon, that Cnut at once occupied London and assumed the full kingship (*Londoniam et scepra cepit regalia*). This is quite inconsistent with what followed the conference at Olney.

⁴ Hist. Ram. lxxiii. Hist. Elyen. ii. 21 (Gale, 502. Stewart, 196). The Ramsey historian grudges the possession of Eadnoth's body to the rival house, and will hardly believe the miracles which were said to vindicate the claim of Ely. It is rather odd that the Ely historian mentions neither the miracles nor the burial of Eadnoth, but he goes on to say that the Ely monks went to the field with certain of the relics of their church, which were lost. Some, he says, said that Cnut carried them away and placed

CHAP. V.
Results of
the battle.

Eadmund
prepares
for a
seventh
battle.

The real loss of the English in this battle seems to have been the loss of so many of the chief men whom it was difficult to replace. This remarkable slaughter of the nobility is emphatically pointed out in all our narratives,¹ and it is not unlikely that it had a real political effect, like the destruction of the mediæval baronage in the Wars of the Roses. But, as a mere military success, Cnut's victory at Assandun does not seem to have been very decisive. At any rate, instead of being followed up by any vigorous blow, it led only to a conference and a compromise between the contending Kings. Neither the spirit nor the resources of Eadmund were exhausted. Indeed he seems to have been readier than his rival to try his fate once more in a seventh battle. As undaunted as ever, he made his way into Gloucestershire,² and there began gathering recruits for a new campaign. He seems to have been actually ready with a fresh army, when Cnut, with his victorious host, came after him. But no battle took place. Eadric—still, strange to say, in the King's confidence—and the other Witan who were with him, the relics of Assandun, persuaded Eadmund, much against his

them at Canterbury. Such a pious robbery would be quite in harmony with Cnut's later character.

¹ Fl. Wig. 1016. "*Occisus est in eâ pugna . . . totus fere globus nobilitatis Anglorum, qui nullo in bello majus umquam vulnus quam ibi acceperunt.*" W. Mahm. ii. 180. "*Ibi Cnuto regnum expugnavit, ibi omne decus Angliæ occubuit, ibi flos patriæ totus emarcuit.*" H. Hunt. (M. H. B. 756 B). "*Illic igitur miranda strages Anglorum facta est; illic occisus est . . . omnis flos nobilitatis Britanniæ.*" For the entry in the Chronicles, see p. 431.

² The narrative in the Chronicles is here clearer than that of Florence. Eadmund goes into Gloucestershire, and Cnut, hearing that he is there, follows with his army. Florence makes negotiations begin a few days after Assandun, without mention of any place, and the final conference takes place at Olney, without any reason being given for either party being there. But that Eadmund was again at the head of an army is clear from Florence himself; "*Quum Rex Eadmundus Ferreum Latus cum Canuto vellet adhuc congregi.*" So Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 756 C); "*Septimâ tamen vice congregati sunt exercitus in Gloucestrescyre.*"

to consent to a conference and a division of the **Kingdom**. The two Kings approached the Severn from opposite sides, Eadmund from the west, Cnut from the east. **They met in an island of the river, called Olney,**² to which the two Kings were, seemingly together with chosen witnesses,³ rowed over from their respective banks of the river. The meeting was a friendly one; we can well conceive that two such valiant captains as Cnut and Eadmund might, in the course of their warfare, conceive a real respect for each other. But, among the many great qualities which Cnut, in after times, gradually developed out of his original barbarism, this particular one of generosity towards personal rivals is one of which we see few signs. Without imputing to Cnut any actual treachery, we may feel sure that in this, as in most other acts of his life, he was actuated by policy rather than by sentiment. Still, from whatever motives, the two Kings treated one another with the utmost courtesy. A division of the Kingdom was the essential principle of the treaty; the two Kings now agreed on details. They settled the extent of their respective dominions, and the

Conference of Olney.

Division of the Kingdom between Eadmund and Cnut.

¹ Flor. Wig. "Licet invitus, ad ultimum quum consentiret."

² The conference between Eadmund and Cnut grows, in many historians from Henry of Huntingdon onwards, into a single combat between them. This, it is ingeniously argued by Mr. Earle (p. 340), arose from a misunderstanding of the words of the Chroniclers, "pa cyningas comon to gædere," words which might imply either a hostile meeting or a friendly conference, but which here do imply the latter. The legend, like other legends, grew, and became, as Mr. Earle says, "one of the established sensation scenes of history." But the best authorities, the Chronicles and Florence, to which we may add the Encomium and the Knytlinga Saga, know nothing of it. William of Malmesbury makes Eadmund give the challenge, which is declined by Cnut, on the ground of his own inferiority in strength and stature.

The Worcester Chronicle, followed by Florence, places the island near Deerhurst. Two other versions of the Chronicle omit the mention of Deerhurst. Mr. Earle places it near Gloucester. But is not the local knowledge of the Worcester writers decisive?

³ So I infer from the proceedings of Cnut after the death of Eadmund.

CHAP. V. amount of money which, as a necessary consequence of any treaty with Danes, was to be paid to the Danish fleet.¹ They also swore oaths of friendship and brotherhood, and, like the heroes of Homer,² they exchanged arms in token of mutual good will.³ The terms of the treaty, indeed the fact of Cnut's consenting to any treaty at all, show how formidable the power of Eadmund must still have seemed. The Imperial dignity remained to the English King,⁴ and he retained the immediate dominion of all England south of the Thames, together with East-Anglia, Essex, and London. Cnut took the remainder, the larger portion of the Kingdom.⁵ As compared with the division between Ælfred and Guthrum,⁶ the dominions of Eadmund were larger in one direction and smaller in another. Eadmund gained Essex and East-Anglia, which, in the earlier division, fell to the lot of the Danes, while he lost the portion of Mercia which was retained—or, more strictly, acquired—by Ælfred. We may suspect that each prince, in case of failure of competent heirs,

¹ Chron. "And þæt gyld setton wið þone here." So Florence, "Tributo quod classicæ manui penderetur statuto." In the Encomium, Cnut makes the division of the Kingdom and a seemingly perpetual payment the two preliminaries of the treaty. "Sed tamen vectigal etiam sue partis vester Rex, quicumque ille fuerit, exercitui dabit meo. Hoc enim illi debeo, ideoque aliter pactum non laudo." This reads like a permanent tribute, which is very unlikely. I understand the words of the Chronicles of a single payment, such as we have so often heard of before.

² As Glaukos and Diomêdês, Il. vi. 230 et seqq. Hektôr and Aias, vii. 303.

³ "Armis et vestibus mutatis," says Florence, but, if the tradition as to the personal stature of the two Kings be correct, a judgement of Cyrus would have been presently needed to restore the clothes to their former owners.

⁴ The blank in Florence (see Thorpe's note) seems to be rightly filled up with the words of Roger of Wendover (i. 459), "ut corona totius regni Regi remaneat Eadmundo."

⁵ The Chronicles simply say, "And feng Eadmund cyng to Westæxan and Cnut to Myrcan," or, as in the Worcester Chronicle, "to þam norð dæle." Florence adds Essex, East-Anglia, and London to the portion of Eadmund. Henry of Huntingdon seems to assign London to Cnut.

⁶ See above, p. 48.

was to succeed to the dominions of the other.¹ It is CHAP. V.
hardly possible that a permanent separation of the two
parts of the Kingdom was seriously intended. Such a
division could not have lasted longer than the joint lives
of the two reconciled competitors, and it would probably
have been annulled at no distant time by the first quarrel
between them.²

England had thus once more for a moment, as in the
days of Eadwig and Eadgar, two Kings. But her two
Kings were now not hostile kinsmen, but reconciled
enemies. After the conference at Olney, the newly made
brothers parted. Cnut's army returned to their ships,
which had doubtless remained in the Thames near London.
The citizens, beneath whose walls the power of Cnut and
his father had been so often shattered, now made peace
with the Danish host. As usual, money was paid to The Danes
them, and they were allowed to winter as friends within winter in
the unconquered city. London.

But meanwhile a sudden event set aside all the late Death of
engagements and made Cnut master of the whole realm. Eadmund
On Saint Andrew's day King Eadmund Ironside died in November
30, 1016.

¹ It was afterwards professed, as we shall presently see, that Cnut was
to succeed Eadmund to the exclusion of his brothers and children. Con-
sidering the terms of the treaty (which Eadmund is said to have dictated—
"Eadmundo dictante," says Roger of Wendover) and the distinct supe-
riority reserved to the English King, it seems only natural to infer that
Eadmund was also to succeed Cnut. Such an agreement, if confirmed by
the Witan, would be good in law, like the will of Æthelwulf (see above,
p. 118); it would be in fact an election before the vacancy. Eadmund at
this time had two infant children, who would naturally be shut out like
other minors. Cnut was childless. It was not till the next year that he
married Emma; and it was only about this time that, according to Saxo
(p. 192), he took his mistress or Danish wife, Ælfwyn or Ælfgifu, the
mother of Harold and Swend. The great object of any such mutual heir-
ship was to exclude the brothers of the two Kings, especially those of
Eadmund.

² See the extract from the Encomium on the next page.

CHAP. V. London. The manner of his death is uncertain. Possibly the overwhelming labours of the last seven months may have worn out the strength even of one whose vigorous frame had won him his distinctive surname. The personal exertions of Eadmund must in truth have been greater than those of any other man in the two armies. Besides actual marching and fighting, there was the going to and fro after each battle to gather fresh troops. This labour must have pressed more severely on Eadmund than on any one else, far more severely than on Cnut, who had his army always ready at hand. It is therefore quite possible in itself that the death of Eadmund was natural,¹ and such a belief is in no way contradicted by our best authorities. But, according to a report which obtained extensive belief, he died by the hand, or at least by the machinations, of Eadric. The traitor, or an instrument of his, slew the King and brother whom he had so often betrayed, and that by a peculiarly base and treacherous form of assassination.² That Cnut himself had a hand

Suspicious
against
Eadric ;

against
Cnut.

¹ Neither the Chronicles nor Florence mention the mode of Eadmund's death ; Florence indeed seems, in a rather marked way, to exclude any imputation on Eadric. He describes later crimes of Eadric, and again refers to his earlier treasons, but he says not a word to connect him with the death of Eadmund. The *Encomiast* (p. 20) piously holds that God, out of His care for the English Kingdom, took Eadmund away. "*Deus, memor suæ antiquæ doctrinæ [a somewhat anthropomorphic way of talking], scilicet, omne regnum in seipsum divisum diu permanere non posse, non longa post tempore Ædmundum eduxit è corpore, Anglorum misertus imperii ; ne fortè, si uterque superviveret, neuter regnaret securè, et regnum diutim adnihilaretur renovatâ contentione. . . . Cujus rei gratiâ eum Deus jussit obire, mox deinde patuit, quia universa regio illic Cnutonem sibi Regem elegit.*"

² William of Malmesbury thus describes the deed ; "*Ejus [Edrici] consilio ferreum uncum, ad naturæ requisita sedenti, in locis posterioribus adegisse.*" He however mentions it only as a rumour, and his rumour charges two chamberlains of Eadmund's with the actual murder. In Henry of Huntingdon, Roger of Wendover, and Brompton (*X Scriptt.* 906), instead of the chamberlains we find a son of Eadric made the actual slayer. This is doubtless intended to increase the horror by making Eadmund die

in the deed is an obvious surmise, and one which his conduct immediately afterwards certainly does not belie. But no English authority hints at any such suspicion; the only writers who attribute the murder to Cnut, or even imply that he was ever accused of the crime, are to be found among the Danish King's own countrymen.¹ But, whether the death of Eadmund was natural or violent, whether Cnut was or was not the instigator of the murder, if murder there was, he at least reaped all the advantage of the opportune end of his former rival and now sworn brother. The uninterrupted succession of the West-Saxon Kings, of the English Emperors of Britain, had now come to an end. The remains of the last, and one of the noblest, of that great line were carried to the common sanctuary of Briton and Englishman, and the body of Eadmund Ironside was laid by that of his grandfather Eadgar in the great minster of Glastonbury. In later times, through all the reconstructions of that won-

Eadmund's tomb at Glastonbury.

by the hand of his own nephew; but a son of Eadric by Eadgyth would still have been a mere child. (See above, p. 363.) In Knighton (X Scriptt. 2317) Eadric does the deed with his own hand. Examples of the same sort of death will be found in Lambert of Herzfeld in the years 1068 and 1076 (pp. 74 and 221 of the lesser Pertz), and a whole German army is said to have been destroyed in nearly the same way, when the Emperor Henry the Fifth invaded Poland in 1109. Dlugossi Hist. Pol. lib. iv. col. 378 (ed. Lips. 1711). Bromton and Knighton have also an alternative story of a mechanical device by which Eadric caused the King's death. According to Adam of Bremen (ii. 51), who makes him the brother of Æthelred, Eadmund was poisoned; "in gratiam victoris veneno sublatus est." All this shows that the manner of Eadmund's death is utterly uncertain. He died unexpectedly and, for Cnut, opportunely; suspicion, true or false, arose, and all manner of tales were bruited abroad. This is as much as we can safely say. As to the place of his death the Chronicles are silent; Florence says London; Henry of Huntingdon places it at Oxford, which must be wrong, Oxford being in Cnut's dominions.

¹ The Knytlinga Saga, c. 16 (p. 178) directly accuses Cnut of employing "Heidrek Strjona," Eadmund's foster-father, to destroy him. Saxo (p. 193) speaks of it only as a rumour; "Memorant alii Edvardum claudestino Canuti imperio occisum." Snorre (c. 24. Laing, ii. 21) attributes the murder to Eadric, without mention of Cnut.

CHAP. V. derful pile, the memory of the hero of Sherstone and Assandun still lived. Till men arose in whose eyes art, history, and religion were alike worthless, he held a worthy place among a galaxy of royal tombs which Winchester or Westminster could hardly surpass.¹ Behind the high altar, in his own chapel as a canonized saint, rested the body of Eadgar the Peaceful. Before the altar lay the supposed remains of the legendary Arthur and his still more legendary Queen. North and south slept two champions of England, alike in name and in glory. On the north side lay Eadmund the Magnificent, one of the brother heroes of Brunanburh, the conqueror of Scot and Cumbrian and Northman, the deliverer of English cities from the heathen yoke. To the south lay his namesake and descendant, as glorious in defeat as in victory, the more than equal rival of the mighty Cnut, the man who raised England from the lowest depth of degradation, the guardian whose heart and arm never failed her, even if his ear lent too easy credence to the counsels of the traitor.²

¹ On the Glastonbury tombs, see Willis, *Architectural History of Glastonbury*, p. 33. The original burying-place of Eadmund was before the high altar. (Will. Malms. de Ant. Glast. Eccl. ap. Gale, p. 306.) His tomb must have been removed on the Invention of Arthur in the time of Henry the Second.

² "De bellis vero Regis Edmundi, et de fortitudine ejus, nonne hæc scripta sunt in historiis veterum cum laude summâ?" H. Hunt. M. H. B. 755 D.

Such a reign as Eadmund's was not likely to be very fertile in documents. Mr. Kemble's collection contains one charter (Cod. Dipl. iii. 369) of "Eadmundus Æðeling Rex," granting lands "æt Pegecyrcan" (Pea-kirk in Northamptonshire) to the new minster at Winchester. Its style, distinctly less turgid than that of most Latin documents of the kind, may be characteristic either of the man or of the circumstances of the time. The point of time when Eadmund was most likely to be exercising acts of sovereignty in Northamptonshire would be in the autumn of 1016, between the battles of Otford and Assandun, when he was drawing troops from Lindesey and other distant parts of the Kingdom.

CHAPTER VI.

THE DANISH KINGS IN ENGLAND.¹

1017-1042.

I HAVE thought it right to narrate the course of events by which the Danish power was established in England at nearly as great detail as I purpose to narrate the central events of my history. The Danish

¹ Our authorities for this period are nearly the same as those for the reign of Æthelred. The Chronicles and Florence are still our main guides, and, as Florence draws nearer to his own time, he more commonly inserts independent matter which is not to be found in the Chronicles. We have the same sort of supplementary help as before from the secondary English authorities, the later and the local writers. We have the same hard task as before in trying to reconcile the English accounts with the various Scandinavian sagas and chronicles. The *Encomium Emmæ* becomes of greater importance, but it must still be used with caution, as the writer, though contemporary, was clearly deeply prejudiced and often very ill-informed. We also begin to draw our first help from one most valuable document, the contemporary *Life of Eadward the Confessor*, published by Mr. Luard. This was written, between the years 1066 and 1076, by one who was intimately acquainted with Godwine and his family, and it helps us to many facts and aspects of facts which are not to be found elsewhere. But the most important point with regard to our authorities for this time is that we must now cease to quote the English Chronicles as one work. The differences between the various copies now begin to assume a real historical importance. The narratives often differ widely from each other, and often display widely different ways of looking at men and things. They show that something very like the distinction of Whig and Tory can be traced as far back as the eleventh century. I pointed out the difference of feeling with regard to Godwine which the different Chronicles display in a paper on the *Earl's Life and Death*, published in the *Archæological Journal* for 1854-1855. (The substance of this article is incorporated in this and the following Chapter.) Since that time Mr. Earle, in the Introduction to his "*Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*," has

CHAP. VI. and Norman Conquests are so closely connected with one another as cause and effect that the history of the one is an essential part of the history of the other. I now come to a period of nineteen years which must be treated in a different way. The reign of Cnut¹ was, as regards England itself, almost a repetition of the reign of Eadgar. It was a period of perfect peace within our own seas. The external events of his reign consist almost wholly of Cnut's wars in the Scandinavian North, the details of which, even if they were less doubtful than they are, do not call for any minute attention at the hands of an historian either of England or of Normandy. After Cnut's power was once fully established in England, we have next to no events to record. Still there are few periods of our history which require more attentive study. We have to contemplate the wonderful character of the man himself, his almost unparalleled position, the general nature of his government

Character
of the
Reign of
Cnut.

gone fully and exhaustively into the matter from his point of view, and has given what may be called biographies of the various records which are commonly confounded under the name of "the Saxon Chronicle." I shall hereafter follow Mr. Earle's nomenclature, (grounded on that of Jocelin, Secretary to Archbishop Parker,) and shall quote them as follows. The manuscript commonly quoted as "C. C. C. C. clxxiv." I quote as the *Winchester Chronicle*. For our period this Chronicle contains only a few entries added at Canterbury. "Cott. Tib. B. i." is the *Abingdon Chronicle*, the only one hostile to Godwine. "Cod. Tib. B. iv." is the *Worcester Chronicle*. "Bodl. Laud. 636" is the *Peterborough Chronicle*, strongly Godwinist. (This part however was composed at Worcester, the Chronicle being transcribed and continued at Peterborough.) "Cott. Domit. A. viii." is *Canterbury*, generally the least valuable of all, but of more importance now than in earlier times.

¹ *Cnut* or *Knud*, in one syllable, is this King's true name, and the best Latin form is *Cnuto*, according to the usual way of Latinizing Scandinavian names. See above, p. 187. The form *Canutus* seems to have arisen from Pope Paschal the Second's inability to say *Cnut*. The later King Cnut, the supposed martyr, was therefore canonized by him as "Sanctus Canutus." See Æthelnoth's *Life of Saint Cnut*, capp. iv. vi. xxxiii. (Langebek, iii. 340, 382.) The writer, an English monk settled in Denmark, thinks the lengthening of the name a great honour, and compares it with the change from Abram to Abraham; but he somewhat inconsistently cuts down his own name to *Ælnothus*.

and policy. A few particular events which directly connect English and Norman history will also call for special examination. Of one event, more important than all in its results, no man could discern the importance at the moment. While Cnut sat on the throne of England, William the Bastard first saw the light at Falaise.

CHAP. VI.

1028.

The remainder of the period contained in this Chapter, including the reigns of the two sons of Cnut, is of a different character. The reigns of those two worthless youths were short and troubled, and the accounts which we have of them from our best authorities are singularly contradictory. But the seven years between the death of Cnut and the election of Eadward are highly important in many ways. Several men who were to play the most important part in the times immediately following, men formed under Cnut, but who, while he lived, were overshadowed by their sovereign, now come forth into full prominence. Foremost among them all is the renowned name of Godwine, Earl of the West-Saxons. These reigns also prepared the way for the Norman Conquest in a most remarkable, though an indirect manner. The great scheme of Cnut, the establishment of an Anglo-Scandinavian Empire, fell to pieces after his death through the divisions and misgovernment of his sons. Harold and Harthacnut disgusted Englishmen with Danish rule, and led them to fall back on one of their own countrymen as their King. But the English King thus chosen proved to be, for all practical purposes, a Frenchman, and his French tendencies directly paved the way for the coming of William. Now it is not likely that any power whatever could have permanently kept all Cnut's crowns upon the same head. But, had his sons been at all worthy of him, a powerful dynasty, probably none the less English in feeling because Danish in blood, might well have been established in England. Under such a dynasty it is still

Character
of the
Reigns of
the Sons
of Cnut.

CHAP. VI. possible that England might have been conquered in the open field. But it is quite impossible that the path of the Conqueror should have been made ready for him in the way that it actually was by the weakness of Eadward and the intrigues of the foreign favourites with whom he surrounded himself.

§ 1. *The Reign of Cnut.* 1017–1035.

Cnut's position at Eadmund's death.
February, 1014.
April, 1016.

The death of Eadmund left Cnut without a competitor.¹ He had already been twice chosen to the English Crown; once by the voice of the Danish host on the death of his father Swend,² and a second time, more regularly, by the vote of the majority of the English Witan after the death of Æthelred.³ He was also most probably, as we have seen, entitled by the Treaty of Olney to succeed to the dominions of Eadmund. He was in actual possession of the larger half of the Kingdom. But Cnut, if valiant, was also wary; it might be too much, especially at this stage of his life, to attribute to him any actual shrinking from bloodshed; but he was at least fully impressed with the value of constitutional forms, and he had no wish to resort to violence when more peaceful means could better accomplish his purpose. He was determined to be King of all England; he was equally determined not to parade

¹ Nothing can be made of an unintelligible story in Snorre (c. 25. Laing, ii. 21), according to which the sons of Æthelred and Emma, assisted by Olaf of Norway and his foster-father Rane, made an unsuccessful attempt upon England after Eadmund's death. The tale may have arisen from some confusion with the later attempt on behalf of the Æthelings made by Duke Robert of Normandy. Snorre is throughout, as we shall often have occasion to see, most ill-informed on English affairs. He makes (ii. 13) Eadmund and Eadward jointly succeed on the death of Æthelred, and Eadmund, Eadwig, and Eadgar—it is singular that he should have known the names of Æthelred's sons so well—are all (ii. 16) made children of Emma.

² See above, p. 404.

³ See above, p. 418.

the right of conquest offensively before the eyes of his *new subjects*, but to rest his claim to the Crown on an *authority* which no man could gainsay. He accordingly *assembled* the Witan of all England in London,¹ no doubt *at the usual* Midwinter festival. Before this assembly the *King of the* Mercians and Northumbrians² set forth his *claim to the* Kingdom of Wessex and East-Anglia, as the *designated* successor of Eadmund according to the Treaty *of Olney*. The danger lay from a possible competition, not *so much* on the part of the infant children of Eadmund, *as on that* of his brothers.³ The witnesses of the Olney *compact* were brought forward and questioned by Cnut. *They affirmed* that no portion of the Kingdom had ever *been assigned* to the brothers of Eadmund; those princes *had received* no portion during his life, and they were *entitled to no right or preference* at his death.⁴ His sons

Witena-
gemót of
London,
Christmas,
1016-1017.

Cnut
claims the
Crown by
virtue of
the Treaty
of Olney.

Testimony
of the wit-
nesses to
the Treaty.

¹ All the Chronicles place the accession of Cnut to the whole Kingdom as the first event of the year 1017. The Winchester Chronicle, in one of its short entries, distinctly says, "Her Cnut wearð gecoren to kinge." Florence might seem at first sight to speak of two assemblies; but, as there is no trace of more than one in the Chronicles, I am disposed to think that the account which he gives under 1016 and the other account which he gives under 1017 are really two narratives of the proceedings of the same Gemót, perhaps rather unskilfully borrowed from two sources. The session of a Midwinter Gemót would probably extend into the year 1017 (Florence begins the year with January 1st), and the formal election and coronation of the new King would very likely be reserved till the Feast of the Epiphany.

² I borrow the title from Florence's description of Cnut's son Harold, "Rex Merciorum et Northhymbrorum," in recording the analogous event of 1037.

³ The use of the plural might tempt us to believe that more than one of the sons of Æthelred by his first wife were still living. Opposition to Cnut's election would be much more likely to be made on their behalf than on the behalf of the young sons of Emma, now in Normandy. Of Æthelstan red's first family, I have shown some reasons for thinking that Æthelstan and Eogbriht (pp. 409, 422) were already dead. Of Eadred and Eadgar we know nothing; Eadwig is the only one who is mentioned in the history by name.

⁴ Flor. 1016. "Quod Rex Eadmundus fratribus suis nullam portionem regni sui, nec se spirante neque moriente, commendasset."

CHAP. VI. were left in the usual position of minors; no immediate stipulation or recommendation had been made in their favour, but it was implied that their rights might possibly revive at some future election.¹ Cnut, the adopted brother of Eadmund, had been named by him as their guardian during their minority. Cnut was then elected King of all England,² the election, it would seem, being accompanied by a formal exclusion of the brothers and sons of Eadmund.³ How far the electors acted under constraint, we know not; but it is certain that no royal election was ever more regular in point of form, and in no recorded transaction do the popular principles of the ancient English constitution stand forth more clearly. The usual compact⁴ between King and people was gone through, with a further mutual promise on the part of Danes and English to forget all old grudges. Money was, as a matter of course, to be paid to the Danish army. With regard to the Ætheling Eadwig, who is described as a prince of high character and the object of universal esteem,⁵ the jealousy of the new monarch was not satisfied with his exclusion from the Crown. A decree of outlawry was passed against him, and also against another Eadwig, who is unknown to us, except that he bears the strange title of King of the

Cnut chosen King of all England. January, 1017.

Outlawry of the two Eadwigs.

¹ Like the sons of Eadmund the Magnificent; see above, p. 118. I suppose this is the meaning of the words of Florence (1016), "*Eadmundum Regem velle Canutum adiutorem et protectorem esse filiorum ejus, donec regnandi ætatem habuissent.*" It cannot mean that Cnut was to resign in their favour when they reached their majority.

² On the title, see above, p. 84.

³ Fl. 1016. "*Fratres et filios Eadmundi omnino despexerunt, eosque Reges esse negaverunt.*" Cf. the former exclusion of the whole house of Æthelred. See above, p. 418.

⁴ Fl. 1017. "*Pædus etiam cum principibus et omni populo* (see above, pp. 108, 112) *ipse, et illi cum ipso percusserunt.*"

⁵ Fl. 1016. "*Eadwius, egregius ac reverendissimus Regis Eadmundi germanus*" So William of Malmesbury (ii. 180), "*non aspernandæ probitatis adolescens.*"

Ceorls.¹ This last Eadwig is said to have made his peace with the King;² but Eadwig the Ætheling—so at least the rumour of the time said—was treacherously assassinated by Cnut's order before the year was out.³

CHAP. VI.
Murder
of the
Ætheling
Eadwig.

In this important Gemót a division of England was made which shows how thoroughly the new King already identified himself with his new Kingdom. It is clear from the whole course of Cnut's reign that, of all his dominions, England was that which he most prized. In the midst of his most brilliant victories, England was always his favourite dwelling-place, in preference alike to his native Denmark, and to any of the other lands which he had brought under his power. In the enumeration of his titles England held the first place. England

Cnut's pre-
ference for
England,

¹ "Eadwig ceorla cyng." "Eadwius, qui *Rex* appellabatur *Rusticorum*." His banishment is placed in this year by Florence, following the Worcester and Peterborough Chronicles; the Abingdon Chronicle reserves it for the Gemót at Cirencester in 1020. Possibly the two entries refer to different events. Eadwig may have been reconciled to Cnut now and have been outlawed again in 1020.

² Flor. Wig. 1017. "Sequenti tempore cum Rege pacificatus est Eadwius."

³ Florence, under these two years, has two narratives about Eadwig, which are difficult to reconcile. In the first, Cnut holds a conference with Eadric, and asks him if he can devise any means for getting rid of the Ætheling. Eadric suggests a nobleman of high rank named Æthelweard (which of all the Æthelweards it is impossible to say), as fitter for the office than himself, as being Eadwig's confidential friend. Æthelweard undertakes to commit the murder, but, like Uhtred (see above, p. 358), does not commit it. In the other story we read that "Eadwius Clito, deceptus illorum insidiis quos eo tendis amicissimos habuit, jussu et petitione Regis Canuti, eodem anno innocenter occiditur." Are these stories one tale or two? The Abingdon Chronicle says, "And Cnut cyning aflymde ut Eadwig æðeling, and eft hine hét ofslean." William of Malmesbury has quite another story; Eadwig leaves England; he wanders about by sea and land; distress of mind brings on illness; he returns secretly to England, lands, dies, and is buried at Tavistock. This story is intrinsically the more probable, because, if the other be true, one does not see how this one should be invented, while tales of secret assassination are always suspicious. On the other hand, the authority of Florence, backed by one of the Chronicles, and that not a Worcester Chronicle, is much higher than that of William.

CHAP. VI. was his home; she was, as it were, the love of his youth; her Crown was the prize which he had won with his own right hand, when he had as yet neither inherited the ancestral royalty of Denmark nor extended his dominion over Norwegians, Swedes, and Wends. And he not only identified himself with England; he identified himself in a special manner with the purely Saxon part of England. Already King of the Northumbrians and Mercians, it would not have been wonderful if he had dealt with East-Anglia and the Saxon shires as conquered dependencies, if he had fixed the seat of his sovereignty in his own earlier half-Danish realm. But Cnut, when once chosen King by the Witan of all England, was determined to fill in every respect the position of the Kings of the English who had been before him. Those Kings were primarily Kings of the West-Saxons; the other English Kingdoms were dependencies of the West-Saxon State. They had gradually been more or less closely incorporated with the dominant realm, but they still remained distinct governments, each with its own Ealdorman and its own Gemót. This form of administration was continued, and was more definitely organized by Cnut. England was divided into four great governments, answering to the four most powerful and permanent among the seven ancient Kingdoms.¹ For his own immediate share he reserved, not Northumberland or Mercia, but Wessex, the cradle of the royal house which he had supplanted. Over the others he appointed Earls, a title which now displaces the more ancient name of Ealdormen.²

and for the Saxon part of England.

His fourfold division of the Kingdom. He retains Wessex in his own hands, and appoints Earls over Northumberland,

¹ The fourfold division is well marked in a Charter of Æthelred (Cod. Dipl. iii. 314; see above, p. 354), which is said to be witnessed by Thegns "sēgðer ge of West-Sexan, ge of Myrcean, ge of Denon, ge of Englon." The "Danes" here must mean the Northumbrians, and the "English," distractedly so called, the East-Angles.

² Florence calls Thurkill and Eric *Comites*, Eadric alone *Dux*. I conceive that *Comes* is meant to translate *Eorl*, and *Dux* to translate *Ealdor*.

FOURFOLD DIVISION OF ENGLAND

Thurkill obtained or retained East-Anglia. King's brother-in-law was confirmed in, or restored government of Northumberland, with which he invested a year before.¹ Eadric, as the reward for treasons and murders, was again appointed to the Earldom of Mercia. But the signatures to the Charters of Eadric, as before with the Ealdorman, so now with its equivalent Earl, the borne equally by the governor of a single shire.² by the subordinate of several such Earls, both English and Danish, through the Charters of Cnut's reign. And them we may discern, as filling a marked position to himself, the name of one who was presently the first man of the English Empire, one who rose by the favour of strangers, only to become the father of Kings. From an early stage of Cnut we see a high and special place among the men of the realm filled by the deathless name of the son of Wulfnoth.

We feel that we are at last approaching the of our history when we introduce the name champion of England against Norman influence of the King who died as her champion against invasion. The sudden and mysterious rise

man. Probably Eadric retained the English title; if use in the old half-kingly sense, and in a year or two altogether from the Chronicles, though it still continued in private documents, and even in Cnut's own Laws.

¹ See above, p. 416.

² So we now apply the title of Lord Lieutenant to the ancient Ealdorman—both to the Viceroy of the kingdom of Ireland and to the military chief of a single county.

the nearest modern title dies out to be used in was its last

this great Norman father

the great

the great

the great

the great

the great

the great

the great

the great

the great

CHAP. VI. man is one of the most striking features of our history, and his origin is perhaps the most obscure and difficult question of all the obscure and difficult questions which our history presents. With no certain explanation of singular a promotion, we find, from the very beginning of the reign of Cnut, Godwine, an Englishman, whose parentage and whose rank by birth are utterly problematical, holding high office under the Danish monarch, honoured with a matrimonial connexion with the royal house, and, before long, distinctly considered as the first subject of the realm. One account represents him as a kinsman of the traitor Eadric; another makes him the son of a churl, seemingly on the borders of Gloucestershire and Wiltshire, who won the favour of the Danish Earl Ulf by incidental services done to him after the battle of Sherstone.¹ But, whatever was his origin, it is clear that his advancement was one of the first acts of the reign of Cnut. Among the foremost men of his newly acquired Kingdom, Godwine recommended himself to the discerning conqueror by his valour in war, his prudence in counsel, his diligence in business, his eloquence in speech, his agreeable discourse and equable temper.² I infer that Godwine had distinguished himself in the war on the side of Eadmund, but that he was early in offering his allegiance to the conqueror.³ The rank of Earl—with what jurisdiction we

Sudden promotion of Godwine by Cnut.

Different statements as to Godwine's origin.

Godwine wins Cnut's favour, and is raised to the rank of Earl. [Before 1018.]

¹ I reserve the question of the origin of Godwine for an Appendix (F.)

² Vita Eadw. ap. Luard, p. 392. "Cum consilio cautissimus, tum bellicis rebus ab ipso Rege probatus est strenuissimus. Erat quoque morum æqualitate tam cunctis quam ipsi Regi gratissimus, assiduo laboris accinctu incomparabilis, jocundâ et promptâ affabilitate omnibus affabilis." Presently he is "profundus eloquio." William of Malmesbury also (ii. 197) speaks of Godwine's eloquence; "Homo affectati leporis, et ingenue gentilitiâ linguâ eloquens, mirus dicere, mirus populo persuadere quæ placerent."

³ "Inter novos adepti regni principes regio ascitos lateri," says Eadward's biographer (u. s.), words which seem most naturally to bear this sense. See Appendix F.

know not¹—was the reward of these merits. We find him CHAP. VI. holding that dignity in the second year of Cnut's reign,² and it is not unlikely to have been conferred upon him in the very Gemót of which we have just been speaking. He became a personal favourite with the King, high in his confidence, and he soon rose to greater power and dignity still.

Cnut's power now seemed firmly established; at the same time he thought it expedient to resort to more than one means of strengthening it. In the month of July in this year he contracted a marriage which is one of the most singular on record. The widow of Æthelred, Ælf-gifu-Emma, was invited to share the English throne a second time,³ and, nothing loth, she came over from Normandy, married the new King, and resumed her old position of Lady of the English. Fifteen years before, she had, in her youth, crossed the sea on the same errand; now, a mature widow, she gave herself to a man who was much younger than herself,⁴ who had overturned the throne of her first husband, and had driven her children

¹ Late writers constantly call Godwine Earl of Kent, a description for which I know of no ancient authority. It is quite possible that Kent may have been his first Earldom; but it is quite as likely that writers who did not know that the West-Saxon Earldom included Kent called him Earl of Kent, simply because they found him long afterwards acting as Earl at Dover.

² The earliest charters of Cnut are of the year 1018, and Godwine signs one of these (Cod. Dipl. iv. 3) as "Dux." The name is so common that it is utterly impossible to say whether any of the signatures of "Godwine Minister" in the later days of Æthelred belong to our Godwine or not.

³ There is something amusing in the form of words employed, with some slight variations, by all the English Chroniclers; "And þa toforan Kal. Augusti het se cyng feccean him þæs oðres kynges lafe Æðelredes him to wife, Ricardes dohtor."

⁴ Cnut was now about twenty-two. Emma, married in 1002, could not be under thirty, and, considering the ages of her parents, the daughter of Richard and Gunnor (see above, p. 279) may well have been much older. The Scandinavian writers do not stumble at a much greater disparity of years, when they make Emma the mother of all the children of Æthelred.

CHAP. VI. into banishment.¹ Cnut's motives for this singular marriage are not very apparent, unless, as one historian suggests, it was part of his system of reconciliation. He wished, we are told, to win the hearts of the English, and to make as little change as possible in the appearance of the English court, by exhibiting in her old place a Queen to whom they were accustomed.² But this would seem to imply that Emma enjoyed a popularity among the English, which the foreign woman, the cause of so many evils, was not likely to have obtained. If a connexion with the ducal house of Normandy was all that Cnut aimed at, a marriage with one of Duke Richard's daughters would have seemed a more natural alliance for the young conqueror than a marriage with their dowager aunt. But it is possible, after all, that personal preference may really have led to this strange match. We have seen³ that it is not impossible that Cnut and Emma may have met for the purposes of negociation during the siege of London. And Emma, though much older than Cnut, may still have retained much of the beauty which won her the title of the Gem of the Normans.⁴ The marriage was, after all, less strange than one which had scandalized the West-Frankish court two generations earlier. Eadgifu, the daughter of Eadward, the sister of Æthelstan, the widow of Charles, the mother of Lewis, had, when already a grandmother of some standing, eloped with the young and handsome Count Herbert, and had presented two half-brothers to her royal son.⁵

¹ William of Malmesbury (ii. 180) is uncertain whether Emma or her brother Richard was most disgraced by the marriage; "Ignoretur majore illius dedecore qui dederit, an feminæ quæ consenserit ut thalamo illius caleret qui virum infestaverit, filios effugaverit."

² Ib. ii. 181. "Ut, dum consuetæ dominæ deferrent obsequium, minus Danorum suspirarent imperium."

³ See above, p. 422 note.

⁴ Hen. Hunt. (M. H. B. 752 A). "Emma, Normannorum gemma."

⁵ Flod. A. 951. Richer, ii. 101. Palgrave, ii. 619. Lewis himself was much younger than his wife Gerberga, daughter of Henry the Fowler and widow of Gilbert of Lotharingia.

At any rate, whatever may have been Cnut's motive in CHAP. VI. his marriage with the royal widow, it is certain that, at the time of his forming this more exalted connexion, he was, like so many of the Norman Dukes, already hampered by an earlier one of that ambiguous kind of which I have often spoken.¹ Cnut had already taken, as his concubine or Danish wife, Ælfgifu of Northampton, the daughter of Ælfhelm the murdered Earl of the Northumbrians.² According to one account, she had already stood in the like relation to Olaf of Norway.³ By her Cnut believed himself to be the father of two sons, Harold and Swend, who, after his death, succeeded to two of his Kingdoms. But scandal affirmed that neither of them was really of royal birth. The barren Ælfgifu had successively passed off on her confiding husband or lover two children whom she affirmed to be their common offspring, but of whom Swend was in truth the son of a priest and Harold the son of a shoemaker.⁴ Ælfgifu was certainly living at the time of Cnut's marriage with her namesake;⁵ whether either of

Cnut's relations with Ælfgifu of Northampton.

¹ See above, pp. 203, 232.

² "The other Ælfgifu," says the Abingdon Chronicle (1035) in distinction from Ælfgifu-Emma. The Worcester Chronicle has "Ælgyfe bære Hamtunisca;" the Peterborough, "Ælfgive Ælfelmes dohtor ealdor-mannes." So Florence, who calls her mother "nobilis matrona Wlfruna." These give her no description either as wife or concubine, neither does William of Malmesbury (ii. 188). In the Encomium she is "concubina" (p. 26, but see below). In Saxo (192) Alwina (Ælfwyn?), as he calls her, is "matrona" and "concubina" at once, but her wooing by Cnut is described in the words "stupro petiit." In Roger of Wendover (i. 462) she is "uxor," but directly after he says "licet alii dicant eos [Swend and Harold] ex fornicatione generatos." Bromton first calls her "concubina" (906) and perverts her name into Ailena, but afterwards (934) she, for it must be the same, is Cnut's "prima uxor sive amasia." At last the author of the Liber Hydæ (p. 267) boldly calls her "Regina."

³ Saxo, 192.

⁴ Flor. Wig. 1035. Cf. Chronn. Ab. Wig. Petrib. in anno.

⁵ Roger of Wendover (i. 462), to avoid possible bigamy, kills off the one Ælfgifu before Cnut's marriage with the other. But, according to the Scandinavian writers, Ælfgifu of Northampton survived Cnut. See Snorre, c. 251 (Laing's Heimskringla, ii. 344 et seqq.) Cf. Saxo, p. 196.

CHAP. VI. her supposed sons was born after that date is not so clear.¹ But it was probably the existence of one or other of these children which made Emma stipulate, as she is said to have done, that the throne should pass to Cnut's children by her, to the exclusion of those by any other wife.² The King agreed, no doubt only so far as he constitutionally could; the marriage took place, and was blessed with the births of Harthacnut and Gunhild. Emma seems to have utterly forgotten, not only the memory of Æthelred, but the existence of her children by him; her whole affection was transferred to the young Danish King, and to the children whom she bore to him.³

The marriages of Emma would seem to have required a blood-bath as their necessary attendant. Her bridal with Æthelred was almost immediately followed by the great massacre of the Danes,⁴ and her second bridal with Cnut was followed, in the like sort, if not by an actual massacre, yet by a considerable slaughter of Englishmen who were felt to be dangerous to the Danish monarch. The whole course of the year was marked by executions and banishments. The Ætheling Eadwig, the most dangerous of Cnut's possible competitors, was removed as we

¹ If the connexion between Cnut and Ælfgifu began when Saxo says it did, one of these children must have been born after Emma's marriage. Cnut, it is to be supposed, reformed in these matters, as in others. The Ramsey historian (cap. lxxx.) calls him "*usus venerii parcus*," and his Laws (51-57. Thorpe, i. 404-6) are strict against all breaches of chastity.

² *Encomium Emmæ*, p. 21. "*Dicebatur enim ab aliâ quâdam Rex filios habuisse.*"

³ Emma, says William of Malmesbury (ii. 196), neglected her children by Æthelred, "*hæreditario scilicet odio parentis in prolem; nam magis Cnutonem et amaverat vivum, et laudabat defunctum.*" To judge from the language of her *Encomiast*, she wished her first marriage to be utterly forgotten; he gives not the least hint that she had ever been the wife of Æthelred; in describing her marriage treaty with Cnut (p. 21) he actually twice calls her *virgo*; and, by a most daring fiction, Eadward and Ælfred are turned into younger sons of Cnut and Emma, sent to Normandy for education, while Harthacnut, as the heir, was kept in England. Cf. p. 22 with p. 28.

⁴ See above, p. 342.

have seen.¹ The rumour of his assassination at least im- CHAP. VI.
plies his death during the year in some shape or other. Fate of the
Of the other sons of Æthelred's first marriage we can give children of
no account, except of those who seem to have been already Æthelred.
dead. His children by Emma were safe in Normandy,
and they did not come back to England with their mother.
The romantic marriage of Eadmund Ironside with Eald-
gyth the widow of Sigeferth² had given him two sons,
Eadmund and Eadward, who were of course mere babes,
and who, from the date of their mother's marriage, would
appear to have been twins. These children were now sent The sons of
out of the Kingdom. The scandal of the time affirmed Eadmund
that Eadric, the common author of all evil, counselled sent to
their death.³ Cnut shrank from the shame of slaying Sweden,
them in England, but—according to one version, by the and thence
advice of Queen Emma⁴—he sought means to have them to Hun-
put out of the way in some distant land. His half-brother, gary.
Olaf or James, the son of his mother Sigrid,⁵ now reigned
over Sweden. To him he sent the babes, begging him to
put them to death. The Swede, a zealous propagator of
Christianity in his own dominions,⁶ abhorred the crime,
but stood in fear of his brother's power. He therefore
sent the children to the King of the Hungarians, the
sainted Stephen,⁷ to be saved alive and brought up. Both

¹ See above, p. 447.² See above, p. 411.³ Flor. Wig. 1017.⁴ This rumour is preserved by Bromton, 907. Though Bromton's authority is as low as any thing can be, the trait is characteristic, and savours of a contemporary scandal-monger.⁵ Sigrid, widow of Eric the Victorious, and mother of Olaf of Sweden, was mother of Cnut by her second marriage with Swend. J. Magni, Hist. Goth. xvii. 17, 18 (Rome, 1554). Olaf died in 1018. Swedish tradition says much of his friendship and hereditary alliance with England, especially with King "Mildredus" or "Eldredus," of all which I find no trace in English history.⁶ Adam Brem. ii. 50, 56.⁷ Florence, followed by Roger of Wendover, calls the Hungarian King Solomon. But Solomon did not begin to reign till 1063. Stephen died in 1038. Thwrocz, Chron. Hung. c. xxxiv. Scriptt. Rer. Hung. (Wien 1746),

CHAP. VI. lived, and one will appear again in our history, to become the source through which the old kingly blood of Wessex found its way into the veins of the later rulers of England and Scotland.

Executions
at the
Christmas
Gemót of
1017.

The Ætheling Eadwig, whatever was his fate, clearly did not die by any judicial sentence. But the Christmas Gemót of this year, held in London,¹ was accompanied by the deaths of several men of high rank, some of whom at least, whatever may have been their guilt or innocence, seem to have died in a more regular way, by the hand of the executioner. These were Æthelweard, the son of Æthelmær distinguished as the Great;² Brihtric, the son of Ælfheah of Devonshire, and Northman, the son of the Ealdorman Leofwine. This last name introduces us to a family which was to play a most important part in the times immediately before and immediately after the Norman Conquest. Of Leofwine personally we know nothing;³ his son Northman is said, on the most suspi-

p. 98. The Chronicles at this stage are silent on the matter, but the poem in the Worcester Chronicle under 1057 says that Cnut sent Eadward "on Ungerland to beswicane"—Sweden is not mentioned. Adam of Bremen (ii. 51) gives them another refuge; "in Ruzziam exsilio damnati." So Karamsin, *Hist. de Russie*, ii. 48.

¹ So Florence; "in nativitate Domini, cum esset Lundoniæ." A different order of events might perhaps be inferred from the Chronicles; but Florence is clearly more careful in his arrangement in this place.

² "Æðelmæres þæs greatan," say the Abingdon, Worcester, and Peterborough annalists. What sort of greatness is implied? This may be the Æthelweard who is said to have failed to slay Eadwig; but this Æthelweard and this Æthelmær must be distinguished from the real or supposed brothers of Eadric. So Brihtric must be distinguished from the Brihtric of the year 1009.

³ He signs a great many charters, but I know of no recorded action of his. A complete pedigree of the family, attached to one of the manuscripts of Florence, but which its contents show not to be earlier than the reign of John, will be found in the *Monasticon*, iii. 192, and it is drawn out in a tabular form by Palgrave, *English Commonwealth*, ii. ccxci. Leofwine is the son of Leofric, the son of Ælfgar, the son of Ælfgar, the son of Leofric, who is placed in the days of Æthelbald of Mercia (716-747. See above, p. 38). Our Leofwine is made contemporary with Æthelstan, Eadmund,

cious of all authorities,¹ to have been a special follower of Eadric. As the whole family were high in rank in Eadric's Earldom, and as the fate of Northman and that of Eadric are connected in our accounts, the statement is probable enough in itself. One thing is plain, that Northman's offence, whatever it was, was something wholly personal to himself and in no way extended to his family.² This fact, together with the advancement of Godwine, should be carefully borne in mind. Whatever was the justice or injustice of these executions,³ they were at least no part of any deliberate plan for exterminating the English nobility, and substituting Danes in their place.⁴ We shall soon see that the policy of Cnut led him in an exactly opposite course.

Eadred, and Eadgar. Agésilaos was the son of Archidamos, and Lewis the Twelfth was the son of the Duke of Orleans who was taken at Agincourt; still it is strange if a man who was not only born but seemingly an Ealdorman, between 926 and 940, was succeeded by a son who himself lived till 1057, and whose widow, much of his own standing, survived the Norman Conquest. Leofric also is made to flourish and found monasteries for the space of at least seventy-eight years. He is "*nobilis fundator multorum cœnobiorum, tempore Edwardi secundi, Ethelredi, Cnutonis, Haroldi, Harlicanuti, et Edwardi tertii Regum Angliæ.*" Such a document is self-convicted. Considering the rarity of the name Northman borne by the son, I am much more inclined to see the father of our Leofwine in an elder Ealdorman Northman, who signs in 994 (Cod. Dipl. iii. 278). Leofwine was Ealdorman of the Hwiccas in 997 (Cod. Dipl. iii. 299); his description the year before (iii. 296) is only "Minister." Besides Northman and Leofric, Leofwine had two other sons, Eadwine (Fl. Wig 1039) and Godwine. Godwine had a son Æthelwine, who was given as a hostage to Cnut, and had his hands cut off ("*à Danis obses manibus truncatus est*") in the mutilation of the hostages in 1014 (see above, p. 407). This curious fact we learn from Heming's Worcester Cartulary (259, 260). I do not see on what evidence Sir Francis Palgrave makes Wulfric Spot (see above, p. 379) a brother of Leofwine.

¹ Pseudo-Ingulf, ap. Gale, i. 57.

² See below, p. 461.

³ Florence (1017) asserts their injustice, the victims died "*sine culpa.*"

⁴ As Dr. Lappenberg (ii. 200) seems to think, on the strength of a passage in the Ramsey History, c. 84. If this be the necessary meaning of the Ramsey writer, his authority is very small on such a point, and the general course of Cnut's conduct looks quite the other way.

CHAP. VI.
Treatment
of the sons-
in-law of
Æthelred.

Thurkill
banished.
1021.

Eadric put
to death.
Christmas,
1017.

The new King however kept a careful eye on all who were in any way connected with the English royal family. The sons-in-law of Æthelred seem to have awakened the suspicions of Cnut almost as strongly as his sons. Of the daughters of Æthelred three were certainly married, to Eadric,¹ to Uhtred,² and to an unknown Æthelstan.³ A fourth is said to have been the wife of Ulfcytel, and to have passed with his East-Anglian government to the Dane Thurkill.⁴ All these persons were gradually got rid of by death or banishment. Æthelstan and Ulfcytel had had the good fortune to die in open battle. We have already seen how easily Cnut was led to consent to the death of Uhtred,⁵ and we shall presently see Thurkill himself, to whom Cnut in a great measure owed his crown, driven into banishment.⁶ The remaining son-in-law of Æthelred, the infamous Eadric, met the reward of all his crimes in this same Christmas Gemót. So short a time had he enjoyed the dignity which he had retained or recovered by so many treasons. That he was put to death at this time is certain,⁷ but that is nearly all that can be said. The renown, or rather infamy, of his name drew special attention to his end, and the retributive justice which lighted on the traitor became a favourite subject of romance.⁸ The immediate cause or pretext of his death

¹ See above, p. 363.

² See above, p. 359.

³ See above, p. 378.

⁴ So Lappenberg (on the authority of Suhm) in his genealogical tree of the West-Saxon Kings. But the name of the wife of Ulfcytel is there called Wulfhild, while Eadgyth was the name of the wife of Eadric (Florence, 1009), and Thurkill's English wife was also an Eadgyth (Florence, 1021. Lappenberg, ii. 197, 207). Was it not the widow of Eadric, not the widow of Ulfcytel, whom Thurkill married?

⁵ See above, p. 416.

⁶ See below, p. 474.

⁷ The three elder Chronicles simply record that Eadric was put to death; the Canterbury annalist adds the place "on Lundene," and ventures to guarantee the justice of the execution—it was done "swyðe rihtlice." The date comes from Florence; "in nativitate Domini."

⁸ I reserve the consideration of the different versions of the tale for Appendix G.

can hardly be ascertained; but the feelings of Cnut towards him may easily be guessed. Eadric, notwithstanding all his crimes, was an Englishman of the highest rank; in the absence of available male heirs, his marriage made him, in some sort, the nearest representative of the royal house; the very success of his repeated villanies shows that he must, somehow or other, have obtained the lead of a considerable party. In all these characters he was dangerous; Cnut must have felt that a man who had so often betrayed his former masters would have just as little scruple about betraying him;¹ he could hardly avoid confirming him in his Earldom in the Assembly of the former winter, but he had doubtless already made up his mind to seize on the first opportunity to destroy him. We may believe that Cnut, as we are told in most versions of the story, gave himself out as the avenger of his adopted brother; but the removal of the arch-traitor was a step which prudence, as prudence was understood by Cnut at that stage of his reign, called for fully as much as justice.

The character and career of Eadric, like those of Ælfric, his predecessor in office and in crime,² form one of the standing puzzles of history. It is difficult to understand the motives for such constant and repeated treasons on the part of one who had, solely by royal favour, risen from nothing to the highest rank in the state. It is equally difficult to understand by what sort of fascination he could have found the means either to work his treasons or to blind the eyes of those who suffered by them. That both his crimes and his influence have been much exaggerated is highly probable. It is likely enough that he has been made the scape-goat for many of the sins both of other

CHAP. VI.

Motives for
his execu-
tion.Character
and influ-
ence of
Eadric.

¹ So Florence; "Quia timebat insidiis ab eo aliquando circumveniri, sicut domini sui priores Ægelredus et Eadmundus frequenter sunt circumventi." It is worth notice that Florence here makes no charge against Eadric of any share in the death of Eadmund.

² See above, pp. 307, 363.

CHAP. VI. individuals and of the whole nation. A tendency of this sort to lay all blame upon some one man is not uncommon in history. Thus we have seen in our Norman history all the mischief that happened attributed, at one time to Arnulf of Flanders, and at another to Theobald of Chartres.¹ But exaggeration of this kind must have had some substantial ground to go upon. Without necessarily believing that Eadric personally wrought all the countless and inexplicable treasons which are laid to his charge, it is impossible to doubt that he knew how to exercise an extraordinary influence over men's minds, and that that influence was always exerted for evil. It may be observed that the crimes attributed to him fall into two classes. His treasons on the field of battle, at Sherstone and at Assandun, were wrought openly, in the sight of two armies, and, asserted as they are by contemporary writers, we cannot do otherwise than accept them. But there is another class of charges which do not rest on the same firm ground. Such are his supposed share in the deaths of Eadmund and Eadwig, his advice to destroy the children of Eadmund, and other cases where his counsel is said to have led to various crimes and mischiefs, or to have thwarted the accomplishment of wise and manly purposes. Some of these charges are not found in our best authorities, and, of those which are, some may well be merely the surmises of the time, going on the general principle that, whenever any mischief was done, Eadric must needs be the doer of it. The annalists could not well be mistaken as to Eadric's conduct on the field of Assandun; they might easily be mistaken as to any particular piece of advice said to have been given by him to Æthelred, to Eadmund, or to Cnut. In these cases their statements prove little more than the universal belief that Eadric was capable of every wickedness. But that universal belief, though it proves

Two classes
of treasons
ascribed to
Eadric.

Difference
in the cre-
dibility of
the two
kinds of
charges.

¹ See above, pp. 239, 252, 260.

little as to this or that particular action, proves every-
 thing as to Eadric's general character. After making
 every needful deduction, enough remains, not only to
 brand the name of Eadric with infamy, but to brand it
 with infamy of a peculiar kind, which holds him up as
 a remarkable study of human character, as well for the
 philosopher as for the historian. We have much more
 both of crime and of sorrow to go through in the course
 of our history; it is at least some comfort that no sinner
 of the peculiar type of Eadric will occur again.

By the death of Eadric, his Earldom of Mercia be-
 came vacant. It was most probably conferred on Leof-
 wine, the father of the slain Northman,¹ who had ap-
 parently hitherto held the Ealdormanship of the Hwiccas
 under the superior rule of Eadric. The Earldom held
 by Northman, probably that of Chester, is said to have
 been conferred on his brother Leofric,² who, some years

CHAP. VI.

Leofwine
 succeeds
 Eadric in
 Mercia.
 Christmas,
 1017.

¹ I infer this from the Charters. Leofric was undoubtedly, at a later time, Earl of all Mercia (Florence, 1041 et pass.); he clearly succeeded his father in something between 1024 and 1032 (see Cod. Dipl. iv. 29 for Leofwine's last signature, and iv. 39 for Leofric's first certain signature as "Dux"); the natural inference is that it was in the Earldom of all Mercia that he succeeded him, and therefore that Leofwine, already an inferior Ealdorman, succeeded Eadric in the general government of Mercia.

² So Florence, 1017. "Leofricum, pro Nortmanno suo germano, Rex constituit Ducem, et eum postmodum valdè carum habuit." But Leofric continues to sign as Thegn, or otherwise without the title of Earl, down to the document of 1032 (Cod. Dipl. iv. 39), when he becomes "Dux." One is therefore tempted to think that he did not become an Earl till 1024-32, and that Florence must have forestalled his appointment by confounding it with the elevation of his father.

There is indeed a document of 1026 (Cod. Dipl. iv. 32) in which Leofric signs as "Dux;" but that grant, though unmarked by Mr. Kemble, seems to me to be spurious. In 1026, not only Leofric, but Siward, who was not an Earl till Harthacnut's reign (see Sim. Dun. X Scriptt. 204, and cf. Cod. Dipl. iv. 67), and Thurkill, who was banished in 1021, all sign as Earls. So do Swegen and Tostig. I know of no Earl Swegen or Swend in Cnut's reign; there is a more than half mythical Tostig in Bromton, 946. Orig. Siw. ap. Lang. iii. 290. Chroniques Anglo-Normandes, ii. 107. One is

CHAP. VI. later, succeeded his father in the government of all Mercia.

Payment
of Dane-
geld.
1018.

Cnut dis-
misses the
greater
part of his
fleet.

Witena-
gemót of
Oxford.
1018.

1015.

Renewal
of "Ead-
gar's Law."

The next year a heavy Danegeld was paid, doubtless that which had been agreed upon in the treaty between Cnut and Eadmund at Olney.¹ London paid ten thousand five hundred² pounds, and the rest of England paid seventy-two thousand. This is something like a measure of the position which the great merchant city held in the kingdom. Cnut was thus able to satisfy the claims of his fleet, and he now retained only forty ships in his pay, sending the rest back to Denmark. The crews of the ships thus retained seem to have been the germ of the famous force of the *Thingmen* or *Housecarls*, of whom, and of the peculiar legislation which affected them, I shall have much to say presently. This same year a Witena-gemót was held, which marks an æra in the reign of Cnut, and which may be looked upon as the winding up of the severities which almost necessarily followed upon the conquest. A large body of the chief men of both nations, Danish and English, assembled at Oxford, the town where a like assembly, three years before, had been dishonoured by the murder of Sigeferth and Morcere.³ Danes and English alike united in a decree for the observance of the Laws of King Eadgar.⁴ This is the first time that we have met with this formula in England, though we have already come across it in Norman history,

strongly tempted to suppose that an unskilful forger put in the names of the two well-known sons of Godwine. Godwine himself signs as "þegn," but before all the other Earls.

¹ It took some time to collect these large sums. Thus the Danegeld voted in 1011 was paid in 1012. See above, pp. 382, 391.

² £10500, according to the Abingdon and Worcester Chronicles and Florence. £11000, according to the Peterborough and Canterbury Chronicles.

³ See above, p. 409.

⁴ The Abingdon Chronicle has only, "And Dene and Engle wurdon sæmmæle æt Oxnaforda." The Worcester annalist makes the important addition, "to Eadgares lage." So Florence; "Angli et Dani apud Oxenafordam de lege Regis Eadgari tenendâ concordēs sunt effecti."

when Cnut's grandfather Harold is said to have restored the Laws of Rolf.¹ It has here the same meaning which it has in earlier and in later examples; the renewal of the Laws of Eadgar has the same meaning as the renewal of the Laws of Rolf after the expulsion of the French from Normandy, as the renewal of the Laws of Cnut after the expulsion of Tostig from Northumberland, as the often promised and often evaded renewal of the Laws of Eadward in the days of the Norman Kings of England. It does not necessarily imply that the princes spoken of were specially looked on as lawgivers. Eadgar and Cnut had certainly some claim to that title, but we know not that Rolf had any, and Eadward certainly had none. But the demand does not refer to Codes of Law issued, or supposed to be issued, by any of these princes. The cry is really, as an ancient writer explains it,² not for the Laws which such a King enacted, but for the Laws which such a King observed. It is in fact a demand for good government in a time of past or expected oppression or maladministration. It is, as in this case, a demand that a foreign King should take the best of his native predecessors as his model. The name of the last King who has left behind him a reputation for just and mild government is taken as the embodiment of all just and mild government. The people in effect demand, and the King in effect promises, that his government shall be as good as that of the popular hero whose name is put forward. Now, with a foreign conqueror for their King, with the ancient royal house reduced to a few exiled children, with the flower of the ancient nobility cut off in the carnage of Assandun, Englishmen looked

CHAP. VI.

Import of
the phrase.

¹ See above, p. 244.

² William of Malmesbury has a remarkable passage to this effect; "Omnes enim leges ab antiquis Regibus, et maxime ab antecessore suo Ethelredo latas, sub interminatione regis mulctæ perpetuis temporibus observari præcepit [Cnuto]; in quarum custodiam etiam nunc tempore honorum sub nomine Regis Edwardi juratur, non quod ille statuerit, sed quod observavit." ii. § 183.

THE DANISH KINGS IN ENGLAND.

. vi. back with yearning to the days of their native rulers.
 The reign of Æthelred was a time which the national
 memory would be glad to deal with as a blank. English
 imagination leaped back to the glorious and happy days
 of the Peaceful Basileus, when Englishmen beat their
 swords into plough-shares and their spears into pruning
 hooks, when the mountains brought peace and the little
 hills righteousness, when the Lord of Wessex could boast
 that, within the four seas of Britain, all Kings fell down
 before him and all nations did him service. And the name
 of Eadgar was one which would be hardly less acceptable
 to the Danes than to the English themselves. When their
 King was more and more throwing off the feelings of a
 conqueror, when he was more and more closely identify-
 ing himself with the realm which he had won, when
 the Earls and Thegns of the conquered land stood
 his throne on a perfect level with the proudest
 conquerors, when the mass of the victorious army
 of Cnut might well tremble, not only for their su-
 periority over the vanquished English, but almost for their
 equality with them. To them the name of Eadgar may
 have represented a prince who was raised to the throne
 by great measure by Danish swords, who, while he
 defended his island against Danish invasions, did full
 justice to the Dane within his own realm, who guaranteed to
 his subjects every right that they could desire, and
 whose fondness for them, among other strangers, was
 fault with which Englishmen could reproach him.¹ Danes
 and English therefore united in looking back to Eadgar as
 the ideal of royalty, and in demanding of their common
 sovereign that he should take that incomparable² example

¹ See above, pp. 67-8.

² "Incomparabilis Eadgarus," says Cnut in his Glastonbury Charter, which, if spurious, as marked by Mr. Kemble (Cod. Dipl. iv. 40), is at least older than William of Malmesbury. (ii. § 185.)

IMPORT OF THE EXPRESSION

as the model of his government. Men looked back to the happy days of Eadgar, the Northumbrians, groaning under the looked back to the happy days of Cnut, demanded the renewal of his Law. They put them, as Englishmen under the Norman to the happy days of Eadward, and put demand that their foreign lords should merely according to the same formal enactments the same spirit of justice and mercy in which saint was held to have ruled. That prayer could not be, granted, till the swords of Robert and Simon of Montfort won back for us more Laws of Eadward in another shape. The great more happily circumstanced. With him the ancient Laws was neither an empty nor an promise. If by renewing the Laws of Eadgar the establishment of a rule as strong and as safe against foreign invasion, as that of Eadgar Cnut fully kept his word.¹

Cnut had now been absent from his native five years, ever since his return to England been driven out by the solitary military exploit of Æthelred the Unready.² It was clearly his intention to make England the seat of his empire,³ but as by the death or deposition of his brother Harold, and as England was perfectly conciled to his government, he deemed it expedient to

¹ "Nec dicto deterius fuit factum," says William of Malmesbury. ii. So in ii. 181; "Ita quum omnis Anglia pareret uni, ille cunctis Anglos sibi conciliare, sequum illis jus cum Danis suis in casu, in cilio, in prælio, concedere." See above, p. 403.

² Adam Brem. ii. 63.

mannos [Norwegians], sæpiissimè autem sedit in Anglia.

³ See above, p. 403.

CHAP. VI.
He is accompanied by Godwine, who is said to have distinguished himself in a Wendish war.

a visit to the land of his birth.¹ He took with him Godwine, whose conduct in this foreign journey, perhaps in one of Cnut's northern wars, procured him a still higher degree of his sovereign's esteem.² According to one account, it was by a gallant action in an expedition against the Wends that the English Earl gained Cnut's special favour. An English contingent under Godwine's command served in the Danish army. The two armies lay near together, and a battle was expected the next day. Godwine, without the King's knowledge, attacked the enemy by night at the head of his countrymen, routed them utterly, and occupied their camp. In the morning Cnut missed the English portion of his army, and hastily inferred that they had deserted, or even gone over to the enemy. He marched however to the Wendish camp, and there, to his surprise, found Godwine and the English in possession, and nothing left of the Wends but their dead bodies and their spoil. This exploit, we are told, greatly raised both Godwine and the English in general in the opinion of Cnut.³ The tale has a mythical sound; but, whatever may be the truth or falsehood of its details, that Godwine rose still higher from the time of this Danish expedition is beyond doubt. Cnut now admitted him to his most secret counsels,⁴ and gave

¹ Chronn. in anno. Fl. Wig.

² Vita Eadw. 392. "Adhæsit comes individuus per omnem viam."

³ I copy this tale from Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 757 B) in the belief that, though the details may be mythical, Godwine did rise still higher in Cnut's favour by some conspicuous warlike exploit during his visit to Denmark. The biographer asserts Godwine's presence in Denmark at this time; he recounts the merits by which he won Cnut's further favour, and among them is "virtutis militia." If the tale be historical at all, it clearly belongs to this year. William of Malmesbury (ii. 181) and Roger of Wendover (i. 466) transfer the story to the Swedish war of 1025, against Ulf and Eglaf. But in that war Cnut was defeated, and altogether Henry of Huntingdon's tale fits in better with the short hints in the Life of Eadward, whose authority, for everything connected with Godwine and his family, is primary.

⁴ Vita Eadw. 392. "Ponit eum sibi à secretis."

him in marriage Gytha, the sister of the Danish Earl Ulf, the husband of his own sister Estrith.¹ This Ulf, the son of Thurgils Sprakaleg, is one of the most distinguished

CHAP. VI.
Godwine
marries
Gytha,
sister of
Earl Ulf.

¹ The biographer (u. s.) marries Godwine to Cnut's own sister; Florence (A. 1049), Adam of Bremen (ii. 52), and Snorre (c. 162. Laing, ii. 252) make Gytha only the sister of Ulf. The authority of the biographer is in itself the highest of all; but, if Gytha were really Cnut's sister, it is inconceivable that any one should have turned her into Ulf's sister, while a sister of the King's brother-in-law might be much more easily mistaken for the King's own sister, or even laxly called so. The Knytlinga Saga (11) and Saxo (196) marry Godwine to a sister of Ulf, but they seem to differ as to the time, Saxo placing it about this time, while the Saga places it earlier. Saxo's words are remarkable; "Benevolentiam enim quam Canutus perfidis Ulvonis meritis denegavit, consanguineæ sibi prolis respectui tribuendam putavit. Quinetiam sororem [Ulf's sister, I suppose, not his own] Anglorum satrapæ Godewino nuptiis junxit, gentem genti animis atque affinitate conserere cupiens." The "Vita Haroldi" (Chroniques Anglo-Normandes, ii. 154-5) contains a strange tale, how Cnut, jealous of Godwine, sent him into Denmark with letters, ordering those to whom they were addressed to cut off his head. Godwine, like the slave of Pausanias (Thuc. i. 132), of course read the letters by the way. "Expalluit novus Urias," says the legend, but it goes on to add that he recovered himself, and adroitly substituted other letters, directing the Danes to receive him as regent, and to give him the King's sister in marriage. All this being done, Cnut puts the best face upon the matter, receives Godwine as a brother, and raises him to the rank of "Consul" or Earl. The same story is alluded to in the Chronicle of Ralph the Black (160); "In Daciam cum breve Regis transmissus callidè duxit sororem Cnutonis." It is also told by Saxo (194) of the way in which Ulf obtained his own wife Estrith.

Ulf's sister being thus mistaken for Cnut's sister, and two statements having arisen about her, the next stage was to divide her into two people. William of Malmesbury (ii. 200) marries Godwine, first to a sister of Cnut, and then to a nameless woman, who is the mother of his historical children. The account of his first wife is an excellent specimen of Norman calumny. She gets great wealth by selling English slaves, especially beautiful girls, into Denmark; she bears one son, who is drowned in the Thames, being carried into the stream by a horse given him by his grandfather [Swend, Wulfnoth, or whom?], while she herself is destroyed by lightning for her misdeeds. Mr. Thorpe (Diplomatarium, 312) seemingly accepts this tale, as he supposes the marriage settlement of a certain Godwine (Cod. Dipl. iv. 10), containing the names of three other Godwines, all alike unknown, to be a record of the imaginary second marriage of the Earl. Bromton (934) and Knighton (2333) tell William's story with improvements, Bromton making Godwine's wife a daughter of Cnut by Ælfgifu of Northampton. See above, p. 453.

CHAP. VI. characters in the Danish history or romance of the time. Like some other famous heroes of the north, his parentage was not wholly human. The father of Thurgils, Biorn, was the offspring of a bear, who carried off a human damsel.¹ Ulf himself is said to have served in Cnut's English war, and it will be remembered that, according to one version, it was to him that Godwine owed his earliest introduction to Cnut.² But in English history he plays hardly any part.³ His marriage we shall have to speak of again, as one of the events connecting England and Denmark and Normandy; but his real or imaginary exploits and treasons,⁴ and his death by order of his brother-in-law, belong wholly to Scandinavian history. But his sister Gytha, the wife of the greatest of living Englishmen, became wholly naturalized in England. She shared the momentary banishment of her husband in the days of Norman intrigue, and she lived to undergo an eternal banishment in the days of Norman dominion. No mother was ever surrounded by a fairer or more hopeful offspring; none ever underwent a longer series of hopeless bereavements. She saw a nephew on the throne of Denmark, a daughter and a son on the throne of England. She saw her other children and kinsfolk ruling as princes in England and allying themselves with princes in foreign lands. But she also saw her brother cut off by the hand of his kinsman and sovereign; she saw one son stained with the blood of a cousin, and another son stained with treason against his house

Her long
and
chequered
life.

¹ Saxo (193) tells the tale at length. Florence also (1049) recognizes the pedigree; "Ulfus, filius Spraclingi, filius Ursi." "Ursus" is seemingly the half-human Biorn, not the Bear himself.

² See above, p. 450.

³ He signs, as far as I know, only two Charters; one (Cod. Dipl. iv. 15) in company with Leofwine, the other (Cod. Dipl. vi. 190) in company with Leofric. This last, which is very unusual, is not signed by Godwine, and the "Harold eorl" who signs it must, as I shall presently show, be distinguished from his son.

⁴ Saxo, 195-7.

CHAP. VI. in his fourfold division of the kingdom, while he appointed Earls over Northumberland, Mercia, and East-Anglia, kept Wessex under his own immediate government. He was now already King of two kingdoms, and he had no doubt by this time began to meditate a further extension of his dominion in the North. He found, it would seem, that the King of all England and all Denmark needed a tried helper in the administration of his most cherished possession, and a representative when his presence was needed in other parts of his dominions. Wessex then, the ancient hearth and home of English royalty, now, for the first time, received an immediate ruler of a rank inferior to royalty. Godwine became the first, and his son Harold was the second and last, of the Earls of the West-Saxons.¹ To reduce the ancient Kingdom to an Earldom was not, as has been sometimes imagined, any badge of the insolence of a conqueror;² the act was in no way analogous to the change of Northumberland from a Kingdom to an Earldom under Eadred.³ The case is simply that the King of all England and all Denmark, King in a special manner of the old West-Saxon realm, found the need of a special counsellor, and, in absence, of a Viceroy, even in this his

Nature and
import of
the office.

or "Comes." There is no record of his appointment to this office—something evidently quite novel, and quite different from any ordinary Earldom of Kent or elsewhere—except the statement of the biographer, which seems exactly to answer to it. "Bajulus," a title familiar in Sicily and the Levant, is precisely the Eastern *Vizier*.

¹ In foreign eyes, it would seem, they were even Earls of the English. Harold, in the Tapestry, figures as "Dux Anglorum," just as the two Hughs had been "Duces Francorum."

² Thierry, with a certain glimmering of truth, says (i. 168), "Après une grande victoire remportée sur les *Norwégiens*, Godwin obtint la dignité d'*Earl*, ou chef politique de l'ancien royaume de West-Sex, réduit alors à l'état de province." He places the appointment between 1030 and 1035, after Cnut's conquest of Norway. But no account speaks of Norwegians as Godwine's opponents; in every version they are either Swedes or Wends. And Wessex was in no sense reduced to the form of a province.

³ See above, p. 64.

BANISHMENT OF THURKILL AND

picion shown on Cnut's part was his of Thurkill with him to England, and Eric also, the Danish Earl of the banished a few years later than Thurkill and at what exact time, is unknown again, we find the banishment "the doughty Earl." Hakon was nephew, as the son of his sister and niece Gunhild, the daughter of another georn King of the Wends.² We have told that Cnut feared to be deprived of his kingdom.³ Hakon seems however not outlawed, but to have been merely expelled which his father had held as Viceroy coupled with Thurkill's similar removal shows that Cnut could trust men whom he thought dangerous in England. After his removal from England Hakon died and in another account, was killed in Orkney

the chief men there; "Statim ut Danemans oppressus est." But, in any matter relating to untrustworthy. But a question arises, who in Denmark? Not Harthacnut, who succeeded in England (Vikbairn) was with his mother in England (Vikbairn) must have been one of the two doubtful sons it may have been convenient to remove from the mother, "the other Ælfgifu." She and Snorri afterwards quartered in Norway (Saxo, 196) were now, in the like sort, quartered in Denmark change of purpose on Cnut's part as to the removal it was Harthacnut who actually succeeded him. Cod. D.

¹ Eric's last signature is in 1023.

² See Appendix H.

³ Fl. Wig. 1029. "Timebat enim ab illo expelli." Hakon's connexion by marriage with Florence, in anno. His blood-kindred as Snorre, c. 19 (Laing, ii. 15).

⁴ Snorre, c. 139 (Laing, ii. 192). This is mean, when he says, "Quasi legationis causa,"

⁵ The Chronicles contain no mention of Hakon

CHAP. VI. domestic buildings for ages after this time. Cnut however employed the rarer material, and the fact that his church was built of stone and lime was looked on as something worthy of distinct record.¹ The stone church of Assandun was something remarkable in Essex, exactly as the wooden church of Glastonbury² was something remarkable in Somersetshire. But the building was small and mean, at least as compared with the stately pile which the next conqueror of England reared in memory of his victory. The foundation of Cnut and Thurkill, for a single priest,³ was poor and scanty, compared with the lordly Abbey of Saint Martin of the Place of Battle. But the minster of Battle simply spoke of the subjugation of a land by a foreign conqueror; the minster of Assandun told a nobler tale. It was reared as the consecration of his victory, as the atonement for his earlier crimes, by a prince who, conqueror as he was, had learned to love the land which he had conquered, to identify himself with its people, and to reign after the pattern of its noblest princes. The Abbot of Battle and his monks were strangers, brought from a foreign land to fatten on the spoils of England.⁴ The single

First appearance of Stigand,

¹ The Canterbury Chronicle is fuller than the others on this head, calling the building "an mynster of stane and lime." This is one of the passages which have been strangely applied to prove that stone architecture was hardly known in England before the Norman Conquest. Any one who knows the buildings of Essex, as compared with those of Somersetshire or Northamptonshire, will at once see that the notice of a stone building as something singular must be purely local. The present church of Ashingdon contains no detail earlier than the last years of the twelfth century; but I suspect that the walls are mainly those of Cnut's minster.

² Will. Malms. ii. 185, and see below.

³ Chron. Cant. "And gief hit [the minster] his anum preoste þas nama was Stigand." William of Malmesbury (ii. 181) calls it "basilica," but goes on to say, "Nuno, ut fertur, modica est ecclesia presbytero parochiano delegata." The words "minster," "monasterium" (as applied to the church as distinguished from the conventual buildings), "moutier," are used very vaguely, and often mean merely a church of any kind.

⁴ The monks of Battle came from Marmoutier. Chron. de Bello, p. 7.

THE DANISH KINGS IN ENGLAND

. vi. one of the most remarkable and, to an Englishman, one of the most interesting, characters in history. There is no other instance—unless Rolf in Normandy be admitted as a forerunner on a smaller scale—of a barbarian being admitted as a ruler, entering a country simply as a ruthless pirate, plundering, burning, mutilating, slaughtering, without remorse, and then, as soon as he is firmly seated on the throne of the invaded land, changing into a beneficent ruler and lawgiver, and winning for himself a place side by side with the best and greatest of its native sovereigns. Cnut never became a perfect prince like Ælfred. An insatiable ambition in possessed him throughout life, and occasional acts of both craft and violence disfigure the whole of his career. No man could charge him with that amiable weakness through which Eadmund lent so ready an ear to protestations of repentance and promises of amendment even from the lips of Eadric. Cnut, on the other hand, always found some means, by death, by banishment, by distant promotion, of getting rid of any one who had once awakened his suspicions. Reasons of state were as powerful with him, and led him into as many unscrupulous actions, as a more civilized despot of later times. But Englishmen were not disposed to canvass the justice of wars in which they won fame and plunder, while no enemy ever set foot on their own shores. They were as little disposed to canvass the justice of banishments and executions when, for many years, it was invariably a Dane, never an Englishman, who was the victim. The law by which the Dane settled in England presently became an Englishman received its highest carrying out in the person of the illustrious Danish King. As far as England and Englishmen were concerned, Cnut might seem to have acted on the principle of the Greek poet, that unrighteousness might be fittingly practised in order to obtain a crown, but that righteousness should be practised in all

CNUT'S PILGRIMAGE TO

other times and places.¹ The throne of England, by devastating wars, by unrighteous exercises of power, even by treacherous assassinations, was, in the eyes of the English, blished, emphatically the throne of righteousness. As an English King, he fairly ranks beside the best of his predecessors. His best epitaph is written on his tomb to his people on his Roman pilgrimage: that his pilgrimage was an ordinary devotional observance to the creed of those times. But, in truth, it was clearly much more than a mere ceremony. The sight of the holy places stirred his patriotic resolves in matters both public and private. As a patriotic King, he employed his meeting with the Emperor, and the Burgundian King, to secure all of them concessions which were desired by the people of his various realms.³ No man

¹ Euseb. Pagan. 534.

ὅτι γὰρ ἀδικεῖν χρηστὴν, τυραννίδος
καλλίστην ἀδικεῖν· τὰλλα δ' εὐσεβείας

² The disputed date of Cnut's journey to Rome is given by Berg, ii. 211. The *Chronicles* and *Florence* derive from its heading, "Rex totius Angliæ et Denmarci et Norwegie et partium Suanorum," would seem to belong to 1027, as he speaks of meeting the Emperor Conrad at Rome. Now Wipo, the biographer of Conrad, (i. 16) that Cnut was present, with the Emperor, at the Coronation at Easter (March 26) 1027. This must conclude with Dr. Lappenberg that the title is an interpolation. Adam of Bremen says that Conrad go together, after the marriage of Cnut and Emma, not take place till after Cnut's death. The coronation of Conrad, but is simply a proof of the domination of Italy; "Italiam ingressus est Cnut is described as "potentissimus et terribilissimus." The letter itself is given by Malmesbury (ii. 308). The *Encomium* of Cnut is much edified by his piety and piety.

³ English and Danish travellers, who were relieved from various tolls and exacted the great sum they had to pay for the

CHAP. VI. in the style in which Cnut writes to all classes of his English subjects,¹ unless he were fully convinced that he possessed and deserved the love of his people. The tone of the letter is that of an absent father writing to his children. In all simplicity and confidence, he tells them the events of his journey, with what honours he had been received, and with what presents he had been loaded, by the two chiefs of Christendom, and what privileges for his subjects, both English and Danish, he had obtained at their hands. He confesses the errors of his youth, and promises reformation of anything which may still be amiss. All grievances shall be redressed; no extortions shall be allowed; King Cnut needs no money raised by injustice. These are surely no mere formal or hypocritical professions; every word plainly comes from the heart. The same spirit reigns in the opening of his Laws.² The precept to fear God and honour the

The Laws
of Cnut.
1028-1035.

gundy was now in its last days, yet Cnut speaks of Rudolf as a prince of importance through his command of the passes of the Alps; "*Rodolphus Rex qui maximè ipsarum clausurarum dominatur.*"

¹ The letter is addressed to the two Archbishops, "*omnibusque episcopis et primatibus, et toti genti Anglorum, tam nobilibus quam plebeiis [Eorls and Ceorls].*" Fl. Wig. 1031.

² Thorpe, i. 358. Schmid, 250. The exact date of these Laws is uncertain. The text itself tells us only that they were enacted by the authority of the Witan ("*mid his witena geþeahte,*" "*venerando ejus sapientum consilio*") in a Midwinter Gemót at Winchester. Mr. Kemble (ii. 259) refers them to some Gemót between 1016 and 1020. Dr. Lappenberg (ii. 201) argues, from the fact that Cnut, in the preamble, calls himself King of the Norwegians, that they must be later than 1028. Dr. Schmid (lv.), on the ground that Cnut never uses his Danish or Norwegian titles in his English charters, looks on them as an interpolation here. He also quotes a text which contains the words; "*And þæt was gewordon sôna swá Cnut cyng, mid his witena geþeaht, frið and freóndscipe betweox Denum and Englum fullice gefæstnode and heora ærran saca getwæmde.*" He therefore holds that the Christmas Gemót at Winchester was one immediately following the Oxford Gemót of 1018 (see above, p. 462). I follow Lappenberg. The scribe quoted by Schmid clearly confounds these Laws with the renewal of Eadgar's Law, from which they are evidently

LAWS OF CNUT.

King here takes a more personal and affectionate
First above all things are men one God to love and
ship, and one Christendom with one truthfulness.
and Cnut King to love the usual subjects, the
Laws themselves embrace the ecclesiastical duties of justice,
manner of manners, the administration of the King and the
strict discharge of all ecclesiastical dues. The King and the
payment of all ecclesiastical dues. The King and the
new national saints, Eadward the King and the
Primate, are again ordered to be observed, and the
servance of the former is again strongly insisted on; on that
way on the authority of the Witan.² The King and the
the Lord's Day is also strongly insisted on; on that
there is to be no marketing, except in cases of absolute
of folk-motes is forbidden, no hunting; even the
city.³ All heathen superstition is to be forsaken,⁴ and
slave-trade is again denounced, except in cases of absolute
lish society is strictly preserved.⁵ The King and the
with the consent of his Witan.⁶ The King and the
tribunals, the old magistracy is to be forsaken,⁴ and
The Bishop and the Ealdorman⁷ still fill their
joint presidents of the Scirgemót, and joint expounders

distinct, and they seem to me to breathe the spirit of the latter
Cnut's reign.

The Laws form two divisions, Ecclesiastical and Secular (worship)
but both alike are enacted by the King and his Witan. I

¹ i. 1. "pæt is þonne ærest, pæt hió ofer ealle cōre þingo ænne
woldan lufian and wurðian, and ænne cristendóm ánrædlice

Cnut cinge lufian mid rihtan getrywðan."² ii. 5.

³ i. 17. The words of Æthelred's Statute (see above, p.
peated.

⁴ "Mid minan witenan ræde," is the form in the preamble
Laws.

⁷ ii. 18. Here the English title Ealdorman is used, but in a
we find the highest rank described as Eorls, clearly in a
liar sense of the word, as the Earl is distinctly
Thegn.

CHAP. VI. the laws, ecclesiastical and secular.¹ The King, as well as all inferior Lords,² is to enjoy all that is due to him; the royal rights, differing somewhat in the West-Saxon and the Danish portions of the Kingdom, are to be carefully preserved, and neither extended nor diminished in either country.³ No distinction, except the old local one, is made between Danes and Englishmen. The local rights and customs of the Danish and English portions of the Kingdom are to be strictly observed.⁴ But this is only what we have already seen in the legislation of Eadgar. The Danes spoken of in Cnut's Laws, as in Eadgar's, are the long-settled Danish inhabitants of Northumberland and the other countries of the *Denalagu*; no sort of preference is made in favour of Cnut's own Danish followers; we cannot doubt that a Dane who held lands in Wessex had to submit to English Law, just as a West-Saxon who held lands in Northumberland must, under Eadgar no less than under Cnut, have had to submit to Danish Law. On one point the legislation of the great Dane is distinctly more rational and liberal than the legislation of our own day. Trespasses on the King's forests are strictly forbidden; but the natural right of every man to hunt on his own land is emphatically asserted.⁵ And as Cnut's theory was, so was his practice. No King was more active in what was then held to be the first duty of

¹ ii. 18. "And þær beo on þære scire bisceop and se ealdorman, and þær segðer tæcan ge Godes riht ge woruld-riht." ² i. 20.

³ ii. 12, 14, 15. ⁴ ii. 15, 45, 49, 63, 66, 72, 84. ⁵ See above, p. 67.

⁶ ii. 81. I put very little faith in the severe hunting code which bears the name of Cnut. Thorpe, i. 426. Schmid, 318. What can be made of such a division of society as we find there? First we hear (c. 2) of "mediocres homines, quos Angli 'les þegenes' (or "læs-þegnæs," see Schmid's note) nuncupant, Dani vero 'yoongmen vocant,'" then (c. 3) of "liberales quos Dani [sic] 'ealdermen' appellant;" then (c. 4) of "minuti homines quos 'Tineman' Angli dicunt;" lastly (c. 12) of "liberalis homo; i. e. þegen." But even here, we find (c. 30) the right of every freeman to hunt on his own ground again asserted.

kingship, that of constantly going through every portion of his realm to see with his own eyes whether the laws which he enacted were duly put in force.¹ In short, after Cnut's power was once fully established, we hear no complaint against his government from any trustworthy English source.² His hold upon the popular affection is shown by the number of personal anecdotes of which he is the hero. The man who is said, in the traditions of other lands, to have ordered the cold-blooded murder of his brother-in-law, and that in a church at the holy season of Christmas,³ appears in English tradition as a prince whose main characteristic is devotion mingled with good humour. In the best known tale of all, he rebukes the impious flattery of his courtiers, and hangs his crown on the image of the crucified Saviour.⁴ He bursts into song as he hears the chant of the monks of Ely,⁵ and rejoices to keep the

Personal
traditions
of Cnut.

¹ Hist. Rams. c. 85. p. 441. "Quum quādam vice Rex Cnuto more asueto regni fines peragraret." Cf. below, p. 488.

² After reading Cnut's Laws, and comparing them with the testimonies already quoted from Florence and William of Malmesbury (see above, p. 462-5), the following declamation of John of Wallingford (p. 549) seems strange indeed ;

"Successitque ei [Eadmundo] ex prædictæ concordie conditione Cnuto Danus et hostis potius Anglorum quam regnator, immutavitque statim statuta et leges scriptas patriæ, et consuetudines, et populum, qui sub omni honore et libertate tempore suorum Regum exstiterat, sub gravi jugo coëgit, nihilque de Ælfredi boni Regis et justī, qui ab undique bonas consuetudines collegerat et scripserat, audire noluit statutis. Sed et omnia quæ vel ipse vel successores legitimè sanxerant, ad suam studuit reducere voluntatem. Sicque factum, ut prædia et possessiones et antiqua præclarorum virorum tenementa suæ adscriberet ditioni. Porro quot et quanta sub pallio ejus protectionis facta fuerint injusta, non est scriptura quæ possit explicare."

³ See the story of Ulf, above, p. 476.

⁴ Hen. Hunt. M. H. B. 757 E.

⁵ Hist. El. ii. 27 (p. 505). Every one knows the lines, somewhat modernized as they must have been by the transcriber ;

"Merie sunge ðe muneche binnan Ely,
Ða Cnut ching reu ðer by ;
Roweð, cnihtes, noer ðe land,
And here we þes muneche sæng."

CHAP. VI. festivals of the Church among them. He bountifully rewards the sturdy peasant who proves the thickness of the ice over which the royal sledge has to pass.¹ One tale alone represents him in a somewhat different light. He mocks at the supposed sanctity of Eadgyth the daughter of Eadgar; he will not believe in the holiness of any child of a father so given up to lust and tyranny. It is needless to add that the offended saint brings the blasphemer to a better mind by summary means.² This tale is worth noting, as it illustrates the twofold conception of the character of Eadgar which was afloat. Cnut is represented as accepting the Eadgar of the minstrels, not the Eadgar of the monks, nor yet the Eadgar of history, who is somewhat different from either. But, even in this tale, Cnut is described as showing something of the spirit which breathes in his Roman letter. The King who reprobated the supposed tyranny of Eadgar could hardly have been conscious of any tyranny of his own.

Cnut's ecclesiastical policy.
1020.

In ecclesiastical matters Cnut mainly, though not exclusively, favoured the monks. His ecclesiastical appointments, especially that of the excellent Archbishop Æthelnoth,³ do him honour, and he was, after the custom

¹ Hist. El. ii. 27 (p. 505).

² Bromton, X Scriptt. 909.

³ Fl. Wig. 1020. "Æthelnothus, qui bonus appellabatur, nobilis viri Ægelmari filius." Æthelnoth was not improbably brother of Æthelweard, one of the victims of 1017. If so, his promotion was of a piece with the favour shown by Cnut to the father and son of Northman, a fellow-sufferer with Æthelweard. See above, p. 461. William of Malmesbury (ii. 184) tells us of the influence for good which Æthelnoth exercised over Cnut; "Regem ipsum auctoritate sanctitudinis in bonis actibus mulcens, in excessibus terrenis." Osbern (Tran. S. Elph. Ang. Sac. ii. 144) calls him "vir sanctus et bonus, et Regi, propterea quod illum sancto chrismate livisset, valdè acceptus." This can hardly refer to Cnut's coronation, as Æthelnoth was not Archbishop at the time of his accession. Had he baptized him? We have no trustworthy account of the time or circumstances of Cnut's baptism. His Christianity seems to be assumed throughout. I have already quoted one wild story from a Danish Chronicle; see above, p. 412. There is also a curious passage of Ademar (ii. 55, ap.

of the age, a liberal benefactor to various ecclesiastical foundations. According to one account, not Assandun only, but all his battle-fields, were marked by commemorative churches.¹ But as Assandun was Cnut's only undoubted victory on English soil, and as men do not usually commemorate their defeats, we may conclude that, in England at least, Assandun was his only foundation of the kind. That church, as we have seen, was a secular foundation, seemingly for one priest only. A more splendid object of Cnut's munificence throws an interesting light on the workings of his mind. The special object of his reverence was Eadmund, the sainted King of the East Angles, a King martyred by heathen Danes,² a saint who was the marked object of his father's hatred, and by whose vengeance his father was held to have come to his untimely end.³ The Christian Dane, King of all England, was eager to wipe away the stain from his house and nation. He made provision for the restoration of all the holy places which had in any way suffered during his own or his father's wars.⁴ But the first place among them was given to the great foundation which boasted of the resting-place of the royal martyr. The minster of Saint Eadmund was rebuilt, and, in conformity with the fashionable notions of reformation, its secular canons had to make way for an Abbot and monks. Some of the new inmates came from

CHAP. VI.

His ecclesiastical foundations.

Saint Eadmund's Bury rebuilt and the foundation

Pertz, iv. 140); "Rex Canotus de Danamarchâ paganus, mortuo Adalrado Rege Anglorum, regnum ejus dolo cepit, et Reginam Anglorum in conjugium accepit, quæ erat soror Comitis Rotomensis Richardi, et factus Christianus utraque regna tenuit, et quoscumque potuit ex paganis de Danamarchâ ad fidem Christi pertraxit."

¹ Will. Malms. ii. 181. "Loca omnia in quibus pugnaverant, et præcipuè Assandunam, ecclesiis insignivit."

² See above, p. 47.

³ See above, p. 403.

⁴ Will. Malms. ii. 181. "Monasteria per Angliam suis et patris excursionibus partim fœdata, partim eruta, reparavit."

CHAP. VI. Saint Benet at Holm,¹ another foundation which was en-
changed. 1020-1032. riched by Cnut's bounty.² One hardly knows whether

Cnut's visit
to Glaston-
bury.
1032.

Cnut most avoided or incurred suspicion by his special devotion to the resting-place of another Eadmund. He visited Glastonbury, in company with Archbishop Æthelnoth, once a monk of that house. There, in the building which tradition points to as the first Christian temple raised in these islands, the building which history recognizes as the one famous holy place of the conquered Briton which lived unhurt through the storm of English Conquest, in the "wooden basilica" consecrated by the memory of so many real and legendary saints, did the Danish King confirm every gift and privilege which his English predecessors had granted to the great Celtic sanctuary.³ A hundred and fifty years after the visit of Cnut, the wooden basilica, which had beheld so many revolutions, gave way to the more powerful influence of a change of taste and feeling, and on its site arose one of the most exquisite specimens of the latest Romanesque art, now, in its state of desolation, forming one of the loveliest of monastic ruins.⁴ At some distance to the east of this primæval sanctuary stood the larger minster of

¹ Will. Malms. u. s. Rog. Wend. i. 464. Tho. Eli. ap. Ang. Sacr. i. 608. John of Oxenedes, p. 19. Thurkill, Queen Emma, and Ælfwine, Bishop of Elmham, aided in the foundation. The monks were partly from Holm, partly from Ely; the Abbot "Uvius" or Wido—either of them very strange names—was from Holm. Of the Canons, some took the vows, others were provided for elsewhere. The change of foundation took place in 1020, but the new church was not consecrated till 1032. Flor. Wig. in anno.

² John of Oxenedes, pp. 19, 291.

³ Cnut's visit to Glastonbury is described, and the charter given at length, by William of Malmesbury, ii. 184, 5. See Cod. Dipl. iv. 40.

⁴ On the "lignea basilica," represented by the Lady Chapel, commonly called that of Saint Joseph, see above, p. 472. On its history, see Professor Willis' Architectural History of Glastonbury, pp. 3, 47, where the tract of William of Malmesbury De Antiquitate Glastoniensis Ecclesie is made use of with the Professor's accustomed skill.

CNUT'S VISIT TO GLASTONBURY.

stone reared by Saint Dunstan. In Cnut's days it was doubtless still deemed a wonder of art, though it was doomed, before the end of the century, to give way to the vaster conceptions of the Norman architects. The invention and translation of the legendary King Arthur as yet distant events, and the new tomb of King Arthur's brother, King Mordred, still occupied the place of honour at the high altar.¹ There the conqueror knelt and covered the tomb of his murdered brother with a splendid robe on which the gorgeous plumage of a peacock was reproduced by the skilful needles of the embroideresses.² Equal honours were paid by another victim of the late wars, in his devotion he was expiating the crimes of his nation, though his own or those of his father's house. The body of the martyred Ælfheah was translated from Saint Dunstan's minster in London to his own metropolitan church, in the presence, and with the personal help, of the king, and of all the chief men of the realm, lay and ecclesiastical. The ceremony was further adorned with the presence of the Lady Emma and her "kingly bairn" Harthacnut. That the two monasteries of the royal city of Winchester came in for their share of royal bounty it is needless to mention. But towards them the favour of Emma seems to have been more fervent than towards any other of her husband's favourites.⁴ Cnut's personal tastes seemed to lead him to the great religious houses of the West, where the dead of Maldon and Assandun reposed.

¹ See above, p. 440.

² Will. Malm. Gest. Reg. ii. 184.

"Super sepulcrum pavoribus figuris pavonum, ut videtur, intextum."

³ The translation is recorded by Florence and all the other chroniclers of the year 1023 (see above, p. 389), but the Worcester Chronicle alone enters into any details. Osbern, the biographer of Ælfheah, describes his translation at great length in a special tract; Anglia Sacra, ii. 143.

⁴ Will. Malms. ii. 181.

pallium missit ver-
country, have
in the

CHAP. VI. choirs of Ely and Ramsey.¹ Nowhere was his memory more fondly cherished than in the great minster which boasted of the tomb of Brihtnoth. There he was not so much a formal benefactor as a personal friend. But he was held in no less honour at Ramsey, the resting-place of Æthelweard. There he built a second church,² and contemplated the foundation of a society of nuns, which he did not bring to perfection. The local historian of the house rewards his bounty with a splendid panegyric, which however is fully borne out by his recorded acts.³ Nor was his bounty confined to England, or even to his own dominions. In his native Denmark he showed himself a diligent nursing-father to the infant church, largely providing it with Bishops and other ecclesiastics from England.⁴ On his Roman pilgrimage the poor and the churches of every land through which he passed shared his bountiful alms, and, by the counsel of Archbishop Æthelnoth, he is said to have given gifts to many foreign churches, especially to that of Chartres, then flourishing under its famous Bishop Fulbert.⁵

Cnut
plants
English
Bishops in
Denmark.
His gifts
to foreign
churches,
&c.

The reign of Cnut, as far as the internal state of

¹ See above, pp. 302, 433.

² Hist. Rams. lxxxi. p. 437. The description of the second church, built near the first, reminds one of Glastonbury, and is worthy the attention of the architectural antiquary.

³ Hist. Rams. lxxx. "Interea Cnuto Rex Christianissimus nulli prædecessorum suorum Regum comparatione virtutum vel bellicæ exercitatione inferior, cœpit sanctam ecclesiam enixissime venerari, et religiosorum causis virorum patrocinari, eleemosynis profluere, justas leges, vel novas condere, vel antiquitatis conditas observare. Quumque non solum Angliæ, sed et Daciæ simul et Norguegiæ principaretur, erat tamen humilitate cernuus, usûs venerei parvus, alloquio dulcis, ad bona suadibilis, ad misericordiam proclivis, amatorum pacis amator fidissimus, in eos autem, qui vel latrocinio vel deprædatione jura regni violassent, ultor severissimus."

⁴ Adam of Bremen (ii. 53) mentions several, Bernard in Scania, Gerbrand in Zealand, Reginberht in Funen. These hardly sound like the names of Englishmen. Gerbrand signs a charter as Bishop of Roskild in 1022. Cod. Dipl. iv. 13.

⁵ Will. Malms. ii. 186.

England is concerned, was a time of perfect peace.¹ No foreign invasion, no revolt, no civil war, is recorded during the eighteen years of his government. We read of no district being ravaged either by rebels or by royal command; we read of no city undergoing, or even being threatened with, military chastisement. This is more than can be said of the reign either of Eadgar the Peaceful or of Eadward the Saint. No doubt the whole nation was weary of warfare; after a struggle of thirty-six years, England would have been glad of a season of repose, even under a far worse government than that of Cnut. But a period of eighteen years in which we cannot see that a sword was drawn within the borders of England was something altogether unparalleled in those warlike ages, something which speaks volumes in favour of the King who bestowed such a blessing on our land. It is true that the old enemies of England were now the fellow-subjects of Englishmen, and that the first attempt of her new enemies came to nought without a blow being struck. Danish invasions ceased when Denmark and England had the same King, and the first Norman invasion, as we shall presently see, ignominiously failed. But a great deal is proved by the absence of any recorded attempt on the part of any Englishman to get rid of the foreign King. No one thought of taking advantage of Cnut's frequent absences from England in the way that we shall find that men did take advantage of the similar absences of William the Norman. It is quite impossible that England and all Cnut's other Kingdoms should have been kept down

CHAP. VI.

Unparalleled internal peace during the reign of Cnut.

¹ Compare Snorre's description of the reign of Cnut (c. 139. Laing, ii. 194); "In his whole Kingdom [seemingly both England and Denmark] peace was so well established that no man dared break it. The people of the country kept their peace towards each other, and had their old country law: and for this he was greatly celebrated in all countries."

CHAP. VI. against their will by the King's Housecarls. It is now
 The that we first hear of this force, the name of which will
 Housecarls constantly occur during the following reigns, even after
 or Thingamen. the Norman Conquest. This permanent body of soldiers
 1018. in the King's personal service probably had its origin
 in the crews of the forty Danish ships retained by Cnut
 when he sent back the greater part of his fleet in the
 second year of his reign.¹ In his time the force con-
 sisted of three thousand,² or at most of six thousand,³
 men, gathered from all nations. For the fame and power
 of Cnut drew volunteers to his banner from all parts of
 Northern Europe.⁴ This force was, in fact, a revival of
 the earliest form of the primitive *Comitatus*,⁵ only more
 thoroughly and permanently organized. Earlier Kings
 and Ealdormen had their immediate followers, their
 "hearth-company," men attached to them by a special
 tie, and found to bear to them a special fidelity in the
 day of battle.⁶ The Housecarls or Thingamen of Cnut
 seem to have been a force of this kind, larger in number,
 kept more constantly under arms, and subjected to a more
 regular discipline than had hitherto been usual. Re-
 ceiving regular pay, and reinforced by volunteers of all
 kinds and of all nations, they doubtless gradually departed

A revival
 of the
Comitatus.

¹ See above, p. 462.

² *Leges Castr.* ap. Langebek, iii. 144. "Cujus summa tria millia militum selectorum explevit. Quam catervam suo idiomate Thinglith nuncupari placuit."

³ Saxo, p. 196. "Clientelam suam sex millium numerum explentem." "Clientela," used by Saxo as a technical word, quite recalls the old *Comitatus*.

⁴ *Leges Castr.* 145. "Tanti Regis exercitus, utpote ex variis collectus nationibus, universis videlicet regnis ditioni suæ subjugatis." Saxo, 197. "Quos quum Rex natione, linguis, ingeniis, quam maximè dissidentes animadverteret." No doubt, among Cnut's other subjects, Englishmen found their way into the service.

⁵ This is the remark of Kemble, ii. 123, 124.

⁶ See especially the account of the "heorð-werod" of Brihtnoth at Maldon. See above, p. 298.

a good deal from the higher type of the *Comitatus*, and approached more nearly to the level of ordinary mercenaries. They were in fact the germ of a standing army, an institution of which we find no sign under earlier Kings, but which later Kings and great Earls, English as well as Danish, found it to their interest to continue. Under Cnut they formed a sort of military guild with the King at their head. A set of most elaborate Articles of War determined the minutest points of their duty.¹ Appropriate punishments² were decreed for all offences great and small, punishments to be awarded by tribunals formed among the members of the guild. But all the provisions of the code relate wholly to the internal discipline of

CHAP. VI.
The Military Laws of Cnut.

¹ The "Witherlags Ret" or "Leges Castrenses" of Cnut are described at length by Saxo, p. 197, and they are drawn up in a tabular form in a separate work by Swend Aggeßon (ap. Langebek, iii. 141). A Danish text follows at p. 159. In the Chronicle of King Eric (Langebek, i. 159), they are, by a somewhat grotesque mistake, attributed, with several other actions of the Great Cnut, to his son Harthacnut. They are said to have been enacted in England after the pacification of the country ("quum in Angliâ, omni exercitu suo collecto, Kanutus Rex defessa bellicis operibus membra quietis tranquillitate recrearet," p. 146) by the advice of Opo, a Dane from Zealand, and his son Eskill. I confess that there is a good deal in the code which to me has a mythical sound, though the general fact that Cnut organized such a force, and enacted strict laws for its government, is not to be doubted. It is rather too great a demand on our faith when we are told that these laws were never broken (save in one famous case) till the reign of Nicolas of Denmark (1101-1130), and when the authority cited for the statement is Bo or Boethius the Wend, an old soldier of Cnut's still living in the time of Nicolas (iii. 154, 163). The one offender in earlier times was Cnut himself, who, in a fit of passion, killed one of his comrades. The Assembly was perplexed as to the way of dealing with such a case, and the King settled the matter by adjudging himself to a ninefold wer-gild. Saxo, pp. 199, 200. So Swend, somewhat differently, iii. 151.

² Traitors were expelled and declared to be "Nothing." They had the choice of departing by land or by sea. He who chose the sea was put alone into a boat, with oars, food, &c.; but, if any chance brought him back to shore, he was put to death. Saxo, 199. Swend, iii. 159. All this sounds very much of a piece with various mythical and romantic tales about people being exposed in boats, of which that of the Ætheling Eadwine, in the reign of Æthelstan, is the most famous. See Fortnightly Review, May 1, 1866, p. 650.

CHAP. VI. the force and to the relations of its members to one another. Of the position in which they stood to the community at large we hear absolutely nothing.¹ And it should be remembered that all our details come from Danish writers and those not contemporary. Our English authorities tell us nothing directly about the matter. From them we could at most have inferred that some institution of the sort arose about this time; because we never read of Housecarls before the reign of Cnut, while we often read of them afterwards. That a body of soldiers, most of them foreigners, were guilty of occasional acts of wrong and insolence, we may take for granted even without direct evidence.² That under a bad King they might occasionally be sent on oppressive errands we shall presently see on the best of evidence.³ But that under

The institution continued by later Kings.

¹ In the undoubted English Laws of Cnut, there is no mention of the Housecarls. There is one passage in the *Witherlags Ret* (Swend, iii. 149) which sets before us the military Assembly as judging, even in causes of real property, among its own members. "*Constitutione etiam generali cautum est, ut omnis inter commilitones orta controversia de fundis, prædiis, et agris, vel etiam de mansuionis deprædatione . . . in jam dicto colloquio agitaretur. Tum vero is, cui commilitonum iudicium jus venditionis adjudicabit, cum sex sortitis in suo cœtu, . . . territorii sui continuatam possessionem sibi vindicare debet, præscriptionemque lege assignatâ tuebitur.*" If Cnut's Court Martials ever really exercised this sort of jurisdiction, it was a clear violation of the constitutional rights of Ealdormen, Bishops, Earls, Churls, everybody; still it need not have interfered with the personal rights of any but members of the guild, and I confess that I should like some better evidence of the fact.

² I can find no evidence for the highly-coloured picture given by Mr. St. John (ii. 99) of the insolence of the Danish Housecarls, though it is likely enough that such things sometimes happened. But the reference which he gives to the Ramsey History (c. lxxxv. p. 441) is only a legend about Bishop Æthelric making a Danish Thegn—married, by the way, to an Englishwoman—drunk, and so getting a grant of lands out of him.

Of course Bromton's tales about Englishmen having to stand on bridges while the Danes passed, having to bow to the Danes, and the like (X Scriptt. 934), prove very little indeed. They are part of an historical confusion which I shall presently have to mention, and they seem to be placed in the time of Cnut's sons rather than in that of Cnut himself.

³ See under the reign of Harthacnut, Flor. Wig. 1041.

the great Cnut they were the instruments of any general system of oppression, that they held the nation in unwilling submission to a yoke which it was anxious to throw off, is proved by no evidence whatever. If to be surrounded by such a body, many of them plainly strangers, to put them in places of trust and honour, and to enrich them by grants of land, is any sign of systematic tyranny, the charge could be far better made out against the sainted King Eadward than it can be against the Danish conqueror.¹

¹ Kemble (ii. 123) collects several instances of grants by Eadward the Confessor to his Housecarls. One (Cod. Dipl. iv. 201) would seem to be in the evil times of Godwine's banishment (1051), as it is addressed to Robert the Norman Archbishop. For “huskarl” the Latin text has “*præfectus meus palatinus*.” But the other two, iv. 204, 221, are addressed to Earl Harold, so that probably no mischief was meant. The will of Bishop Wulfwig of Dorchester (Cod. Dipl. iv. 290), also quoted by Mr. Kemble, is witnessed, among a crowd of other people, great and small,—from Queen Eadgyth and Earl Harold to the whole body of citizens of Lincoln—by all the King's Housecarls, “on eallra ðæs kynges hūscarlan,” who are followed by his chaplains, “on his mass-preōstan,” equally in a body. On signatures of this kind, see above, p. 410.

One point more remains about the Housecarls. In the so-called Laws of Eadward the Confessor (Thorpe, i. 449) and in Bracton (iii. 15. 2, 3), the legal processes of “Murdrum” and Presentment of Englishry are traced up to the institutions of Cnut. When Cnut, we are told, sent away the mass of his Danish troops, at the request of the Witan (Barones de terrâ), the Witan pledged themselves that the rest should be safe in life and limb (*firmiter pacem haberent*), and that any Englishman who killed any of them should suffer punishment. If the murderer could not be discovered, the township or hundred was fined. Out of this, we are told by Bracton, grew the doctrine, continued under the Norman Kings, that an unknown corpse was presumed to be that of a Frenchman—in Cnut's time, doubtless, that of a Dane—and that the “Englishry” of a slain person had to be proved. The “Laws of Eadward” of course contain no notice of “Englishry” as opposed to Frenchry—if I may coin such a word; but neither do they mention it as opposed to Danishry. They simply record the promise of the Witan—not an unreasonable one—that Cnut's soldiers should be under the protection of the Law. This is quite probable; anything more probably comes from carrying back Norman institutions into earlier times. In the *Dialogus de Scaccario* (i. 10) there is no hint of the “Murdrum” and “Englishry” being older than the Norman Conquest.

CHAP. VI.
Foreign
policy of
Cnut.

It remains to speak of Cnut's relations with countries beyond the limits of England. This subject starts several important points in the history of foreign lands, but, as far as English history is concerned, most of them may be passed by in a few words. Within our own island, we hear little of Wales, and out of it, Cnut's wars with the other Scandinavian powers and his relations to the Empire, though highly important, have hardly any bearing on English history. The case is different with his dealings both with Scotland and with Normandy, both of which, the latter especially, call for a somewhat fuller examination.

Relations
with
Wales.

Eglaf
plunders
Saint
David's.
1022!

Cnut, as King of all England, alike by formal election and by the power of the sword, of course assumed the same Imperial claims and Imperial style which had been borne by his predecessors. As King of all England, he was also Emperor of all Britain, Lord of all Kings and all nations within his own island. Of his relations with his Welsh vassals we are driven to pick up what accounts we can from their own scanty annals. Early in Cnut's reign, on what provocation we know not, the exploit of Eadric Streone¹ was repeated. Wales was invaded by Eglaf, a Danish Earl in Cnut's service, probably the same man who had joined in Thurkill's invasion of England, and who, according to some accounts, was brother of that more famous chief.² He ravaged the land of

¹ See above, p. 381.

² See above, p. 376, and Lappenberg, p. 475 note, in the original German. Mr. Thorpe (ii. 210) has turned Eilaf or Eglaf into Ulf, to the utter perversion of Lappenberg's meaning. Eglaf's name is attached to several charters of Cnut (Cod. Dipl. iv. 2, 28, 29). On the death of Cnut he is said, for what cause we are not told, to have left England and to have sought a refuge in Germany. Brut y Tywysogion, 1036. One can hardly doubt the identity of these two Eglafs, and yet the words of the Brut (1020) might almost make us think that Eglaf was some wandering Wiking; "After that Eilad (al. Eilaf) came to the Isle of Britain, and Dyved was devastated and Menevia was demolished."

RELATIONS WITH WALES AND SCOTLAND.

Dyfed and destroyed Saint David's.¹ This is our sole CHAP. VI.
fact, except that in one of the last years of Cnut's reign,
a Welsh prince, Caradoc son of Rhydderch, was slain 1035
by the English.² Our own Chroniclers do not look on
these matters as worthy of any mention. With the Scotch
the case is somewhat different, especially as affairs
of that Kingdom are closely mixed up with those of
the great Earldom of Northumberland. We have the same
that, on the fourfold division of England, the same
Northern government was entrusted to the actual
who seems however not to have disturbed the actual
lish possessors. He probably retained a superior
them till his banishment,³ after which, it is clear
family of the former Earls remained in possession
reigning Earl, Eadwulf, the son of the elder
and brother of Uhtred, is described as a tim-
cowardly man, who, according to one account
surrendered Lothian to King Malcolm for fear
might avenge the victories won over him by his
But if any cession was made to the Scots at
it was most probably extorted by Malcolm by
arms. For the second year of Cnut was marked
Scottish invasion and a Scottish victory of un-
portance.⁴ King Malcolm entered England, ac-

- ¹ Ann. Camb. 1022. "Eilaf vastavit Demetiam. Menoria
- ² Ann. Camb. 1035. Brut. 1033.
- ³ See above, p. 416.
- ⁴ Sim. Dun. X Scriptt. 81.
- ⁵ Sim. Dun. u. s. "Timens ne Scotti mortem suorum
ut supra dictum est, occiderat, in se vindicarent." He was, according to
Simeon, "ignavus valde et timidus."
- ⁶ The authorities for this battle are the Melrose Chronicle (in anno), and
two entries of Simeon of Durham in his general History (De Gest. Regg. in
anno) and in his History of the Church of Durham (iii. 5. ap. X Scriptt. 30).
The first (p. 155) simply says, "Ingens bellum inter Anglos et Scottos
apud Carham geritur." This entry seems an abridgement of that in
Simeon's Annals; "Ingens bellum apud Carrum gestum est inter Scottos

CHAP. VI. by Eogan or Eugenius, seemingly an under-King of Strathclyde.¹ A great battle took place at Carham on the Tweed, not far from the scene of the more famous fight of Flodden, in which the Scots gained a decisive victory over the whole force of the Bernician Earldom. The slaughter, as usual, fell most heavily upon the English nobility.² Bishop Ealdhun is said to have fallen sick on hearing of the event, and to have died in a few days. His great work was all but accomplished. The height of Durham was now crowned by a church, stately doubtless after the standard of those times, of which only a single tower lacked completion.⁴ It was probably a result of the confusion produced by the Scottish inroad that three years passed between the death of Ealdhun and the

et Anglos, inter Huctredum filium Waldef Comitem Northymbroꝝ, et Malcolmum filium Cyneth Regem Scottorum, cum quo fuit in bello Eugenius Calvus Rex Lutinensium." From neither of these accounts shall we learn which side was victorious. But in the Durham History Simeon becomes explicit, if not exaggerated; "Universus à flumine Tese usque Twedam populus, dum contra infinitam Scottorum multitudinem apud Carum dimicaret, penè totus cum natu majoribus suis interiit." It is not clear whether this is the event referred to by Fordun (iv. 40), where he tells us that Duncan was sent to meet the Danes and Northumbrians (qui tunc velut una gens coierant), who were on their march to ravage Cumberland. He met them and defeated them with great slaughter. Fordun seems to place this before the death of Æthelred; in so confused a writer the chronological difficulty is of no great consequence; it is of more importance that a Northumbrian army, marching to invade any part of Cumberland, would hardly pass by Carham.

Uhtred, mentioned as the English leader in one of Simeon's accounts, was already dead. See above, p. 413. His brother Eadwulf must be the person meant.

¹ Robertson's Scotland under her Early Kings, i. 98, 99. "*Lutinensium*," in Simeon, according to Mr. Robertson, should be "*Clutinensium*."

² Simeon (u. s.) speaks of the English army as the force of the land between Tees and Tweed, that is, of ancient Bernicia without Lothian.

³ The "natu majores" of Simeon are doubtless the "yldestan" of our English Chronicles, see above, p. 78. On this slaughter of the nobility, compare at Assandun, p. 431.

⁴ Simeon (u. s.); "De ecclesiâ quam inceperat solam turrin occidentalem imperfectam reliquit."

succession of the next Bishop Eadmund.¹ According to one theory, which I shall discuss elsewhere,² the annexation of Lothian to the Scottish Kingdom was the result of this battle. It is equally strange that a prince like Cnut should have consented to the cession of any part of his dominions, and that he should have allowed a Scottish victory to pass unrevenged. But we do not, in our English authorities, find any mention of Scottish affairs till a much later stage of his reign. According to the Scottish account, Duncan, the grandson of Malcolm through his daughter Beatrice, who now held the under-kingdom of Cumberland or Strathclyde, refused, though often summoned, to do homage to Cnut.³ His refusal was cloked under a show of feudal loyalty; his homage was due only to the lawful King of the English; he would render no kind of service to a Danish usurper. Cnut, after his return from his Roman pilgrimage, marched against his refractory vassal, with the intention of incorporating his dominions with the English Kingdom.⁴ Certain Bishops and other chief men stepped in to preserve peace; Duncan withdrew his claim to independence; Cnut relinquished his design of complete incorporation; the under-King of Cumberland was again to hold his Kingdom on the old terms as a vassal of the Emperor of the Isle of Albion. Such is the Scottish story, which characteristically puts Cumberland in the foreground, and leaves out all mention both of Scotland proper and of Lothian. It may very likely be true in what it asserts; it is eminently false in what it conceals. For

CHAP. VI.

Affairs of
Cumber-
land.Submission
of Duncan.

¹ Simeon, Hist. Dun. iii. 6. Flor. Wig. 1020.

² Appendix B. See above, p. 67.

³ Fordun, iv. 41. "Non enim hactenus Anglorum Regi Cnutoni, quia regnum invaserat, pro Cumbria Duncanus, quamquam iterum et iterum ab eo summonitus, homagium fecerat, quia non inde sibi de jure, sed Regibus Angligenis fidem deberi Rex rescripsit."

⁴ So I understand the words of Fordun (u. s.), "Cumbriam suo [Cnutonis] subdendam dominio."

CHAP. VI. there is no doubt that Cnut's dealings with his Northern neighbours were by no means confined to Cumberland, but touched Scotland itself quite as nearly. It is very possible that both Duncan and his grandfather Malcolm refused homage to Cnut on the ground that the Dane was an usurper of the English Kingdom. If so, they seem to have been brought to reason at an earlier time than would appear from our own Chronicles only. According to a French historian, an expedition of Cnut's against the Scots was hindered, and peace restored, by the intercession of Queen Emma and her brother Duke Richard.¹ According to a Norwegian Saga, two Scottish Kings, Malcolm and Duncan, submitted to him in the early years of his reign.² However this may be, it is certain, on the highest of all authorities, that the whole Kingdom of Scotland did in the end submit to his claims. Cnut, like William after him, was not minded to give up any prerogative of the

Submission
of Scot-
land.
1031.

¹ Such seems to be the meaning of Rudolf Glaber, ii. 2, who adds that Cnut became godfather to Malcolm's son. So Mr. Thorpe, in a silent insertion in Lappenberg's text (ii. 218. p. 480 of the original). But why should Duke Richard trouble himself about the Scots? Rudolf is certainly no great authority on English affairs. As far as I can get any meaning out of his words, he looked on Æthelred as King of the Danes and on Cnut as King of the West-Saxons; "*Mortuo Rege Adalrado, in regno scilicet illorum qui Danimarches cognominantur, qui etiam duxerat uxorem sororem Ricardi Rotomagorum Ducis, invasit regnum illius Rex videlicet Canus Occidentaliū Anglorum, qui etiam, post crebra bellorum molimina ac patrie depopulationes, pactum cum Ricardo stabiliens, ejusque germanam Adalradiam.*" He then goes on to tell of Cnut's expedition against "Melculo" King of Scots, to whom he gives an excellent character.

² Snorre, c. 140. pp. 195, 6. "King Canute reigns over Denmark and England, and has conquered for himself a great part of Scotland." "It is but lately that two Kings came to him from the North, from Fife in Scotland, and he gave up his wrath against them, and allowed them to retain all the lands that they had possessed before, and gave them besides very valuable gifts." This is placed before 1025. These stories may be only confused versions of the transaction of 1031, but on the whole they seem to make an earlier submission on the part of the Scots more probable than not.

Crown which he had won. The more famous ceremony of Abernethy forty years later was now forestalled. As the younger Malcolm then became the man of the Norman, so now the elder Malcolm became the man of the Dane.¹ Cnut, after his return from Rome—in the very year of his return, according to those who give the later date to that event—marched into Scotland, meeting, it would seem, with no opposition. Malcolm now, if not before, rendered the long-delayed homage, and with him submitted two other Scottish chiefs, on both of whom our Chronicles bestow the title of King. With the otherwise unknown Jehmarc is coupled a name not obscure in history, but far more famous in romance. Along with the homage of the elder Malcolm King Cnut received also the homage of Macbeth.²

CHAP. VI.
[1073.]

Malcolm,
Jehmarc,
and Mac-
beth do
homage to
Cnut.
1031.

This fact that the under-Kings, or princes of whatever rank, within the Kingdom of Scotland, did homage to Cnut is worthy of special notice. It seems to be a step beyond the terms of the original Commendation to Eadward the Elder. It seems to be a step towards the more complete submission made by William the Lion to Henry the Second and to the homage done by all Scotland to the Lord Paramount Edward. The choice of the English King as Father and Lord over the King and people of the Scots did not make this or that Scot his "man."³ But now, not only King Malcolm, but Jehmarc

Import of
the homage
of the
under-
Kings.

¹ Chron. 1031, cf. 1072-3. The particular phrase of "becoming his man," which both the surviving Chronicles, Worcester and Peterborough, apply to the event of 1073, is found under 1031 in the Worcester Chronicle only. But the language of the Peterborough and Canterbury Chronicles is to the same effect; "Scotta cyng him to beah."

² "Mælbæpe," "Mealbæaðe," are the forms in those Chronicles (Peterborough and Canterbury) which speak of him at all. But he must be the same as the "Macbeoðe" of the Worcester Chronicle in 1054, that is, the Machabeus of Fordun, the Macbeth of Shakespere. Mr. Robertson (i. 97) seems unable to identify Jehmarc.

³ See above, p. 143.

THE DANISH KINGS IN ENGLAND.

R. VI. a prince of those times, is highly praised.¹ He was more over a zealous Christian; his whole soul was devoted to spreading throughout his Kingdom the blessings of Christianity and civilization, and to reforming the manners and morals of his people in every way. He brought Bishops and other churchmen from England, and, not satisfied with the evangelization of his own Kingdom, he employed them as missionaries in Sweden, Gothland, and the neighbouring islands.² But, just like the elder Olaf, his choice of means was often less laudable than the excellence of his objects. The reformer used harshness and violence to force on a rude nation manners and institutions for which they were unprepared, and the Christian missionary degenerated into a persecutor of those who clung to the creed of their fathers. In his exalted ideas of kingly power, Olaf set little store by the rights either of the ancient chiefs or of the free peasantry of the land, and, in dealing with these enemies, he did not shrink from the merciless cruelty characteristic of the age.³ Cnut no doubt always kept as careful an eye on Norway as his father had kept on England; but, like his father, he knew how to bide his time. A summons to Olaf to hold the crown of Norway as his vassal was rejected;⁴ war followed, and Cnut's first expedition was unsuccessful. Olaf allied himself with the Swedish King Omund, and their joint forces inflicted a defeat on Cnut's combined Danish and English army at the river Helga, in Scania.⁵ Two years later, by dint of bribes and promises,

Cnut's defeat at the Helga.
1025.

¹ See Adam of Bremen, ii. 55. and cf. Florence, 1027.

² Adam, u. s.

³ Snorre, c. 74 (Laing, ii. 84).

⁴ Snorre, c. 140 (Laing, ii. 194).

⁵ On this battle see our *Chronicles in anno*, Snorre, c. 140 (Laing, ii. 194). Saxo, pp. 194, 5, Ann. Isl. (Lang. iii. 40), where it is placed in the year 1027. In the English account the battle seems to be only, whose commanders are Ulf and Eglaf, as Rognvald mentioned by Snorre, c. 95. There is no mention of the Swedish King, nor of Norwegians at all. I presume that we may accept the pre-

and by studiously taking popularity, Cnut contrived in Norway which was pre- In the next year, when fifty ships, Olaf was come and had to take refuge in welcomed, and he was chosen Thing at Trondhjem, just before, chosen King of all London.² A later attempt of was resisted by the Norwegians; fight of Stiklestad, and the martyr.³

sence of Olaf and Omund on the combination accounts; but Saxo must be understood with Cnut's brother-in-law, and in rebellion against his own sovereign. Snorre makes danger, and it is seemingly jealousy at this it which, according to him, led to the death pp. 476, 483. Eglaf again is doubtless quite we have already come across. See above, that William of Malmesbury and other English the exploit of Godwine in 1019. See above, follows the Chronicles; Florence is silent. the Chronicles, p. 342. I do not however quote be "the boundary between Sweden and the ancient frontier between Sweden and Scania the river.

¹ Flor. Wig. 1027. Saxo, 196. "Olavum vendam pecuniâ a se corruptos domestico bello oppressit. 165, 171, 175. In an earlier part of his work that the Norwegians preferred a foreign and a took tribute, and let the ancient laws and usage and resident King commonly interfered with the

² Snorre, c. 180.

³ See Snorre, c. 235 et seqq. Flor. Wig. 1030. battle seems a well attested fact, yet this last autum in bello peremptum, quidam vero in medio per magis expositum. [The title of "martyr" seeming theatre.] Sunt alii qui asserunt illum in gratiâ Ræsum, quod et magis verum esse non diffidimus, invasit."

CHAP. VI.
Cnut's
friendly
relations
with the
Empire.

Cnut, King of five or, as some reckon, six Kingdoms,¹ seems to have looked upon himself as Emperor of the North, and to have held himself as in all respects the peer of his Roman brother. Earlier and later Danish Kings were fain to own themselves the vassals of Cæsar; but before the power of Cnut the Roman Terminus himself had to give way. With the Frankish Emperor Conrad, the mighty ruler of Northern Europe was on the best terms. Cnut, as we have seen, made his acquaintance and friendship in his Imperial capital, and perhaps bore a part in the splendours of his Imperial consecration.² The alliance was cemented by a treaty of marriage between their children, and by a cession of territory on the part of the potentate

¹ Six according to Saxo, 196, who does not give their names. His commentator Stephanus (p. 212) says, "nempe Danie, Svecie, Norvegie, Anglie, Sclavie, Sembie" [Semba or Samland in Eastern Prussia?]. The Encomiast (p. 23) says, "Quinque regnorum, scilicet Danomarchie, Anglie, Britannie, Scotie, Nordwegæ, vendicato dominio, *Imperator* exstitit." Swend Aggesson (c. 5. Lang. i. 54) outdoes them all. Cnut's Empire extends over the adjoining realms ("circumjacentia regna suo aggregavit *Imperio*") from Thule to the Byzantine frontier ("ab ultimâ Thyle usque ad Græcorum ferme Imperium"), taking in, seemingly, not five or six, but ten kingdoms; "quippe Hyberniam, Angliam, Galliam, Italiam, Longobardiam, Teotoniam, Norwagiam, Sclaviam, cum Sambia sibi subjugavit." Swend clearly believes in three Empires, Greek, German, and Scandinavian. With his exaggerations compare those of Dudo, see p. 209.

² A German writer might be tempted to turn this fact into evidence of vassalage on the part of Cnut; and Wipo (Vit. Chuon. c. 16) perhaps shows a slight tendency to do so; "His ita peractis in duorum Regum præsentia, Ruodolfi Regis Burgundie et Chnutonis Regis Anglorum, divino officio finito, *Imperator duorum Regum medius* ad cubiculum suorum honorificè ductus est." But the loyal Swend (c. 5) has quite another story. Henry, already Emperor and already husband of Gunhild (neither of which he became till after Cnut's death), is driven from Rome by a sedition. Cnut sets forth to avenge the wrongs of his son-in-law. On the road, seemingly as a sort of pastime, he ravages Gaul (primò Galliam depopulando invasit); he then harries Lombardy and Italy (which Swend again distinguishes), he compels the Romans to receive the Emperor back again, he returns through France (which Swend almost seems to distinguish from "Gallia"), and translates the relics of Saint Martin from Tours to Rouen. So Saxo (196), somewhat more briefly. I suppose all this grew out of the Roman pilgrimage!

highest in formal rank.
and Emma, was betrothed
afterwards the renowned
of the greatest princes west
of the West. The marriage
till after the death of the
like her predecessor Eadgy
the wife nor the mother of
Eadgyth, died before her husband
pire, and his successor was the
better known marriage with

The more strictly political
tween Cnut and Conrad was the
frontier between Denmark and
torious expedition of Otto the
a German Mark had been established

¹ On this marriage see Saxo, 196.
Hepidanni Annales 1036 (ap. Duchesne
Annales Hildesheimenses in anno (ap.
Malmesbury (ii. 188), who is eloquent
progress. (Cf. Roger of Wendover, iv.
Isabella, daughter of John, with Freder
the marriage took place in 1036, there
of Malmesbury however makes Harthacnut
But Harthacnut was not in England in 1036
her from Denmark, or Emma from England.
Hildesheim Annals, changed her name from
liam has a legend about her which is the same as
Queen Eleanor in Percy's Reliques. The
Henry.

² See above, pp. 63, 252. The Roman de
in saying—

“Gunnil fu à Rome menée,
Et à Rome fu mariée;
Fame fu à l'Emperéor:
Ne pout avoir plus halt Seignur

The one English princess, Matilda, daughter of
was the mother of an Emperor, was not the wife of
of a King.

³ See above, p. 295.

CHAP. VI. extending from that river to the Dannevirke, the great bulwark which Gorm and Thyra had reared against the Southern invader. This was the first step in that process which has gradually Germanized a part of Southern Jutland, and which has at last handed over an unwilling Scandinavian population as the victims of Prussian greed of territorial aggrandizement. Cnut, by treaty with the Emperor, and seemingly as the price of his daughter,¹ recovered the ancient frontier with which Charles the Great had been content,² and which remained the boundary of the two realms till that general removing of ancient landmarks which characterizes the more refined diplomacy of modern times.³

Affairs
of Nor-
mandy.

[997.] We have now, last of all, to consider the position of Cnut with reference to the Duchy of Normandy. The last event in the internal history of Normandy which I recorded was the great revolt of the Norman peasantry at the beginning of the reign of Richard the Good. The new Duke was, in every sense of the word, a Frenchman. Whatever had become of the original homage of Rolf, the Commendation of Richard the Fearless to Hugh the Great⁴ was still in full force. Richard was

¹ So I infer from Adam of Bremen, ii. 54. "Cum Rege Danorum sive Anglorum, mediante Archiepiscopo [Unwan of Bremen], fecit pacem. Cujus etiam filiam Imperator filio suo deposcens uxorem, dedit ei civitatem Sliaswig cum marchâ quæ trans Egdoram est, in foedus amicitie; et ex eo tempore fuit Regum Danie."

² On the Eider as the boundary of the Carolingian Empire, see the Annals of Eginhard, 808, 811, 815, 828, and the Annals of Fulda (Pertz, i. 355 et seqq.), 811, 857, 873. Nothing can be plainer than the last passage, "fluvium nomine Egidoram, qui illos [Danos] et Saxones dirimit."

³ One should perhaps except the period of confusion, 1806-1814, when the Roman Empire had been dissolved and when the German Confederation had not yet been founded. During these years Holstein, the "Transalbiana Saxonia" of Eginhard, was united to the Kingdom of Denmark by an act as regular as any other act of that irregular time.

⁴ See above, p. 249.

the loyal vassal and faithful ally of the Parisian King; his friendship with Robert, the second Capetian monarch, seems to have always remained unbroken, and the two princes acted together in various expeditions. The Normans were by this time thoroughly naturalized in their French possessions. In the records of the time they appear as recognized and honoured members of the Capetian monarchy. The memory of their foreign and heathen descent is forgotten; their Prince is no longer the mere Duke of Pirates,¹ whom a loyal Frenchman spoke of as seldom as he could; the cherished ally of the Parisian King is now spoken of with every respect as the Duke of Rouen. The chief French historian of the time is as ready to exaggerate the external power and influence of the second Richard as ever his own Dudo was to exaggerate those of his father.² And, no wonder; for it is plain that the Norman Duke was the mainstay of the French Kingdom. Robert, though the most pious of men, could not avoid either temporal warfare, ecclesiastical censures, or domestic oppression.³ In the last two

CHAP. VI.

Friendly
relations
with
France.

996-1031.

Strict
alliance be-
tween King
Robert
and Duke
Richard.

¹ See above, pp. 187, 192.

² Rudolf Glaber (ii. 2) seems specially anxious to assert a dominion over Britain for Richard the Good just as ever Dudo was for Richard the Fearless. (See above, p. 209.) After relating the supposed mediation of Richard between Cnut and Malcolm, he goes on; "Cœpit ergo ex illo fieri, ut si qua hostilis necessitas Rotomagorum Duci incumberet, à transmarinis insulis in suum auxilium exercitum sumeret copiosum. Sicque diutius gens Normannorum scilicet ac prædictarum populi insularum tuti pace fidissima, ut ipsi potius formidine suæ potentie plerosque exterarum provinciarum terrent populos quam ipsi ab aliis terrentur." Duke or Earl of Rouen (Rudu Jarl) is also the title which the Norman princes bear in the Northern Sagas. See Vita Olai Trygg. p. 263, and Laing, ii. 16. Richard is "Dux" here; he is "Rotomagorum Comes" in cap. 8, and "Princeps" in iii. 1. In Ademar (iii. 55) he is "Comes Rotomensis" and "Rotomagi."

³ King Robert's domestic troubles, his uncanonical marriage with his first wife, and the bondage in which he lived to his second, are well known. Constance, according to Rudolf Glaber (iii. 9), was "avarissima, maritique magistra." The influx of her southern countrymen to the court of Paris

- CHAP. VI. classes of afflictions Norman help could hardly avail him, but in all Robert's wars Richard proved a steady and valuable ally. The help of the Norman Duke enabled his suzerain
1003. to maintain his claims on Ducal Burgundy,¹ and Norman troops served along with those both of the French King and of the German Cæsar in a war against their common vassal of Flanders. The Imperial and royal
1006. saints conjoined their forces against the city of Valenciennes, and the more purely temporal help of the Norman Duke was arrayed on the same side.² With his Breton neighbours or vassals Richard was on good terms.
- Friendly relations with Brittany. The friendship between him and the Breton Count Geoffrey was cemented by an exchange of sisters between the two princes. Richard married Judith of Brittany,³ and Hadwisa of Normandy became the wife of Geoffrey, ~~on~~
1008. whose death her sons, Alan and Odo, were placed under the guardianship of their uncle and suzerain.⁴ With another neighbour and brother-in-law Richard found it less easy to remain on friendly terms. His sister Matilda had married Odo, Count of Chartres, a son of the old enemy Theobald. The town and part of the district of Dreux had been given to Odo as her marriage por-

is described by Rudolf in language which reminds one of England under Henry the Third.

¹ This Burgundian war is described by R. Glaber, ii. 8, Will. Gem. v. 15. The Norman contingent is said to have amounted to 30,000 men.

² See Sigebert's Chron. 1006 (Pertz, vi. 354), and the Gesta Episc. Cameracensium, i. 33 (Pertz, vii. 414). Both writers allow Robert the title of "Francorum Rex;" Richard is, in Sigebert, "Comes Nortmannorum," in the Gesta, "Rotomagensium Dux." I need hardly say that the Emperor Henry the Second was a canonized saint, and King Robert certainly deserved that honour as much as many who received it.

³ She founded the Abbey of Bernay in 1013. W. Gem. vii. 22. See Neustria Pia, 398. Her church is standing, though desecrated, a noble example of early Norman Romanesque.

⁴ W. Gem. v. 13. Count Geoffrey going on a pilgrimage to Rome, left his dominions and his sons "sub Ducis advocatu." He died on his way home.

REIGN OF RICHARD THE GOOD.

tion,¹ and this, on her death, he refused to restore. war followed, which was made conspicuous by the foundation of the castle of Tillières,² which long remained a border fortress of Normandy. Of course every effort was made by Odo to take or surprise the Norman outpost was rendered hopeless by Norman valour, and yet, we are told, Richard found it expedient to resort to help of a very questionable kind to support him against his enemy. The Normans were now Frenchmen; Duke Richard and his court gentlemen³ had most likely quite forgotten their Scandinavian mother-tongue; some traces of the old national language may still have lingered at Bayeux, but, as a whole, Normandy was now French in language, feeling, and religion. But the old connexion with the North was still cherished. We have already seen how the friendly reception which the Danish invaders of England met with in the Normans ports had led to hostile relations between Normandy and England.⁴ So now we have the old story of Harold Godwinson's defeat at Blaataud over again.⁵ Richard, like his father, does not scruple to bring heathen invaders into Gaul to help him against his Christian enemies. And, just as in the second appearance of Harold Blaataud, this disgraceful help was called in at a time when there seems to be no need for it, at a time when the Norman arms are completely victorious. Odo could surely have been crushed by the combined forces of Normandy and Brittany,⁶ even if King Robert was not disposed to repay in kind the services of his loyal vassal. The tale however, as we find it, represents

¹ On the war with Odo, see W. Gem. v. 10-12. Roman de Rou, 6974. Cf. R. Glaber, iii. 2, 9.
² "Castrum Tegulense," W. Gem. v. 10. "Tuillieres," Roman de Rou, 6627.

³ See above, pp. 314, 330.

⁴ See above, p. 281.

⁵ See above, pp. 242 et seqq., 262.

⁶ "Adscitis Britonibus cum Normannorum legionibus," says William of Jumièges, v. 10.

THE DANISH KINGS IN ENGLAND.

Norman Duke as entering into a league with two h
Sea-Kings, who were engaged in inflicting the mos
ravages on his own vassals and allies of Brittany,
just taken and burned the town of Dol.¹ These Ki
described as Lacman of Sweden and Olaf of N
With regard to the former there must be a mis
some kind, as no King bearing any such name
in Swedish history. But we are given to understand that
the Olaf spoken of was no other than the famous Olaf
Haraldsson the Saint.² One story of the early life of Olaf
appears about as mythical as another; but something is
proved when two independent narratives agree — Of the
busy career in England which the Northern legends assigns
to Olaf not a trace is to be found in any English writer.
But the presence of Olaf in Normandy is asserted alike
by Norman and by Norwegian tradition. According to
the Norman tale, the devastators of Brittany left their
prey, sailed to Rouen in answer to the Duke's summons,
and were there honourably received by him. But, if
Duke Richard did not shrink from such guests at Rouen,
King Robert was naturally afraid of their appearance at

¹ W. Gem. v. 11. Roman de Rou, 6885-6928.

² The names in William of Jumièges are Olavus and La
text of the Roman de Rou has Colan and Coman, but the
to have various forms, Solan, Laman, and Olef. Mr. Thorpe (Lappenberg,
Norman Kings, p. 35) points out the error of Depping (ii. 177) and
Prevost (Roman de Rou, i. 346), who suppose this Olaf to be Olaf Trygg-
vesson. Nothing can be plainer than that both Olaf and Wace meant
their Olaf for Olaf Haraldsson, as they speak of his subsequent martyrdom.
Mr. Thorpe adds, "Lagman is the name of an official, an Angl. lawman."
So it is, and names of offices, from Pharaoh onwards, have often been mistaken
for proper names; but would a Sea-King be called a Lawman? Mr. Thorpe
supposes that the two Kings were "two petty Scandinavian potentates"
from Ireland." Depping (ii. 175) identifies this Sea-King with one in
(Ademar, iii. 53, ap. Pertz. iv. 139); but this is placed by Pertz in 1020,
and the whole story is quite different. Wherever a Sea-King appears
he brings a mythical atmosphere with him. invaded Aquitaine

RELATIONS OF RICHARD WITH THE NORTH.

Paris. After the treatment which the Bretons have received, all France was endangered by their presence. The King then held, what is so rare in the history of France, so common in that of England and Germany, an Assembly of the Princes of his realm.² The royal summons was obeyed both by the Duke of the Normans and by the Count of Chartres. Peace was made by the mediation of the Count Odo kept his town of Dreux, and Duke Richard kept his new fortress of Tillières. The heathen King were to be got rid of as they might. Duke Richard persuaded them by rich gifts to go away then, and to promise to come again if they were wanted. One of them, Cnut, was converted to Christianity with many of his comrades. He was baptized by Archbishop Robert, and his career of sanctity begins forthwith.³

Stories of this sort can hardly be admitted into history without a certain amount of dread lest the historian prove to have opened his text for the reception of a piece of romance. They are stories which we cannot venture unhesitatingly to accept, but which we are not in a position unhesitatingly to deny. They are stories which it is safest to say that the details are almost surely be mythical, but that there is probably some ground of truth at the bottom. It is impossible to read this of the alliance of Richard the Good with Olaf and Lac without a lurking feeling that it is simply the tale of Richard the Fearless and Harold Blaaland moved

¹ Will. Gem. v. 12. "Robertus verens ne ab eis Franci moliretur."

² Ib. "Satrapas regiminis sui convocavit, ambosque apud Coldras convenire mandavit." This is a somewhat discordant French King to use towards a Norman Duke, but it is a story which a writer who records it. On the rarity of such assemblies in France, see above, p. 275.

³ Will. Gem. v. 12. Roman de Rou, 6975. This of course proves that Olaf Haraldsson is meant, but it proves nothing as to the historic truth of the story.

THE DANISH KINGS IN ENGLAND.

VI. its old place and fitted with a new set of names is hardly possible to avoid going a step further, and as whether the mythical element is not strong in the tale of Harold Blaatand himself. And it is hardly less difficult to read the story of the two heathen Kings, of whom one is converted, while the other seemingly goes away and is necked in his old errors, without asking whether the tale is not merely a repetition of the history of the dealings of Æthelred with Swend and Olaf Tryggwesson twelve years before.¹ Still we are hardly justified in altogether rejecting stories which we cannot disprove, and which rest on authority, certainly not first-rate, but still such as we are generally content to accept for statements which have no inherent improbability about them. And, after all, in this particular case, the mere existence of the stories proves something of more importance than the particular facts which they profess to relate. Whether the tales either of Harold or of Olaf be historically true or not, the fact that such tales could obtain belief, and could find a place in recognized Norman history, shows that a strong feeling of connexion between Normandy and the Scandinavian mother-land must have lived on, even after all outward traces of Scandinavian descent had passed away.

Another feature in Norman history, which has its beginning in the reign of Richard the Good, is still more closely connected with our immediate subject. It was in the days of this prince that the Normans of the Norman Duchy began to play an independent part beyond their own borders, and to enter on that series of foreign expeditions and foreign conquests of which the Norman Conquest of England was the last and greatest example.²

¹ See above, p. 317.

² The Norman Conquest of Sicily was actually later than that of England; but then the conquest of Apulia and the conquest of Sicily were merely two acts of the same drama.

DISTANT NORMAN EXPEDITIONS.

The earlier Dukes had founded the Duchy, they enlarged its borders, they had defended it against aggression from without, and had developed it against within. The alliance between Richard the Good King Robert had caused the Norman arms to be respected throughout the length and breadth of France. But now the limits both of the Norman Duchy and the French Kingdom became too narrow for the energy both of the sovereigns of Normandy and of their subjects. Circumstances had hitherto caused the part taken by Normans in Europe to be partly defensive and secondary. They had resisted French, English, and man invasions, and had aided their Lords, ducal and at Paris in a variety of military adventures. But now no invader was to be feared, now that the state held a fully established position in France Europe, the old Scandinavian spirit of distant and distant conquest awoke again. The Christian life and fortune in distant lands as ever his heathen French-speaking Norman was now as ready to jeopardise actual Crusades had not yet arrived, but already actual Crusades had not yet arrived, but already warfare of all kinds had been. The days of all kinds had not yet arrived, but already believers was beginning to be clothed with charm in the eyes of the Christian chivalry of Normandy. As yet no distant conquest had been undertaken by Norman Duke. Yet, even under Richard the power of Normandy employed beyond the limits of the French Kingdom, and in a cause was not that of any immediate interest of the Duchy. Besides the campaign in which Duke vindicated the claim of his over-lord over the Burgundy, he carried his arms beyond the frontier Kingdom into that further Burgundy which still its allegiance to Cæsar. Reinold, Count of the

CHAP. VI. dian Palatinate, had married Richard's daughter Adelin.
Towards the end of Richard's reign, this prince fell into the hands of his turbulent neighbour, Hugh, Count of Challon¹ and Bishop of Auxerre. Hugh was a vassal of France, while Reinold's dominions were held in fief of the Emperor. But neither King nor Cæsar stepped forward to chastise the wrong-doer or to set free the captive. It was a Norman army, under Richard, son of the Duke, which presently taught the Count-Prelate that a son-in-law of the Duke of the Normans could not be wronged with impunity.²

But far greater and more enduring exploits than these were wrought during the reign of Richard, not by the public force of the Norman Duchy, but by the restless energy of individual Norman adventurers. An attempt at a Norman settlement in Spain came to nought; but in this period were laid the foundations of that great Norman settlement in Southern Italy which had such an important effect on the future history of Europe.

Exploits of
Roger of
Toesny in
Spain.
1018.

Roger of Toesny first carried the Norman arms into the Spanish peninsula. Spain had long before attracted the attention of a Norman sovereign; it was to Spain, as a heathen land, to which Richard the Fearless had persuaded the unbelieving portion of his Scandinavian allies to depart.³ It was in Spain, as the battle-ground of Christian and Saracen, that Roger now sought at once to wage warfare against the misbeliever and to carve out a dominion for himself. Roger was of the noblest blood of Normandy, boasting a descent from Malahule, uncle of Rolf,⁴ and he may well have looked down upon the

¹ Challon, or Cabillo, in Ducal Burgundy, which must be distinguished from Châlons, or Catalauni, in Champagne.

² Will. Gem. v. 16. Roman de Rou, 7292-7370.

³ See above, p. 262.

⁴ Will. Gem. vii. 3.

NORMAN EXPLOITS IN SPAIN AND SICILY.
 upstart gentlemen whose nobility had no higher source than the tardy bridal of their kinswoman Gunnor.¹ Roger are told of his daring, his hard-won victories, his us tales ferocity.² His marriage with the daughter of the Countess of Barcelona, a Princess whose cannib wide ance was French,³ but whose dominions were formal lasting root. Spanish, was no doubt designed as the beginning of a new ta

The exploits of the Normans in Italy, which the reign of Richard, form a theme of the highest interest, but one on which it is dangerous to enter may be drawn too far away both from the subject and from those which directly bear upon the English, and even on Norman, affairs the these great events was merely indirect. One doubt that the wonderful successes of their minds of those Normans who stayed at home in the South of Europe contributed to the greater conquest nearer home was not in the unsuccessful attempt of Duke Robert, who shall presently have to mention, and the of his greater son, may well have been suggested by the exploits of the sons of Tancred, who When private adventurers thus grew into a party of what might not be done by the sovereign of Apulia, himself, wielding the whole force of the land of Normandy, which gave

¹ See above, p. 279.

² According to Ademar, who records several of his exploits, he daily slew and boiled a Saracen prisoner, and compelled the comrades of the slain man to eat of his flesh. He himself only pretended to partake. Ademar, iii. 55 (Pertz, iv. 140). Richard Cœur de Lion, according to some legends, went a step further; he ate freely and pronounced that no other meat was so strengthening for an Englishman.

³ See above, p. 173.

CHAP. VI. birth to men like them? For it must be remembered that the Norman conquest of Apulia was no national enterprise, no conquest made in regular warfare waged by the Duke of the Normans against any other potentate. Private Norman adventurers, pilgrims returning from the Holy Land, Norman subjects under the displeasure of their own Duke,¹ gentlemen of small estate whom the paternal acres could no longer maintain, gradually deprived by the Roman Empire of the East² of the remnant of its Western possessions, and won back the greatest of Mediterranean islands from the dominion of Mahomet to that of Christ. The sons of Tancred of Hauteville began as Vikings who had changed their element; they gradually grew into Counts, Dukes, Kings, and Emperors. And, when the first horrors of conquest were over, no conquerors, not even Cnut himself, ever deserved better of the conquered. The noble island of Sicily, so long the battle-field of Europe and Africa, the land which Greece, Rome, Byzantium, had so long striven to guard or to recover from the incursions of the Carthaginian and the Moor, became, under her Norman Kings, the one example of really equal and tolerant government which the world could show. Under the Norman sceptre the two most civilized races of the world,³ the Greek and the Saracen, could live together in peace, and could enrich their common country with the results of skill and industry such as no Northern realm could rival. For once we are driven to blush for our

¹ R. Glaber. iii. 1. "Normannorum audacissimus, nomine Rodolphus, qui etiam Comiti Richardo displicuerat, cujus iram metuem," &c. Cf. Ademar, iii. 55.

² The respectful way in which Rudolf (u. s.) speaks of the Eastern Empire is worth notice. We read of "Imperator Basilius sancti Imperii Constantinopolitani," "tributa, quæ Romano debentur Imperio," namely by the Italian cities, &c.

³ I speak of course only of such civilization as is implied in progress in science, art, and learning. Political civilization came neither from the East nor from the West nor yet from the South.

common Teutonic blood, when we see how this favoured portion of the world, the one spot where contending creeds and races could display their best qualities under the rule of a common and impartial ruler, was enslaved and devastated and trodden under foot by the selfish ambition of a Teutonic invader.

CHAP. VI.
Conquest
of Sicily by
Henry the
Sixth.
1194-5.

The relations of Richard with England, his war with Æthelred,¹ his dealings with Swend,² his reception of his fugitive brother-in-law and his children,³ have been already spoken of. With Cnut he seems to have maintained perfect peace. His nephews, the sons of Æthelred and Emma, found an asylum at his court, but only an asylum. Of any attempt on their behalf, of any interference in the internal affairs of England, the wary Duke seems never to have thought. We must hasten on to the reign of another Norman Prince, whose relations to our island were widely different.

Unbroken
peace be-
tween
Richard
and Cnut.

Richard died after a reign of thirty years. Before his death he assembled the chief men of his Duchy, and by their advice he settled the Duchy itself on his eldest son Richard, and the County of Hiesmes on his second son Robert as his brother's vassal.⁴ Disputes arose between the brothers; Robert was besieged in his castle of Falaise, and when peace was made by the submission of Robert, the Duke did not long survive his success. After a reign of two years he died by poison,⁵ as was generally believed,

Death of
Richard.
1026.

Reign of
Richard
the Third.

¹ See above, p. 330. ² See above, p. 372. ³ See above, p. 398.

⁴ W. Gem. v. 17. "Cunctos Normannorum principes apud Fiscannum convocat." "Richardum filium suum *consultu sapientum* [mid his Witena geþeaht] præfecit suo Ducatui, et Robertum fratrem ejus Comitatus Oximensi, ut inde illi persolveret debitum obsequii." See above, p. 196.

⁵ Will. Gem. vi. 2. "Cum suorum nonnullis, ut plurimi rettulerunt, veneno mortem obiit." So Roman de Rou, 7434 et seqq. William of Malmesbury (ii. 178) more distinctly mentions the suspicion against Robert; "Opinio certè incerta vagatur, quod conniventia fratris Roberti . . . vim juveni venefica consciverit." So Chron. Turon. (Duchesne, iii. 360); "Hic dicitur veneno necasse Richardum fratrem suum."

INGS IN ENGLAND.

brother.¹ Robert, popularly familiar
Magnificent, is most familiar error.
the father of the Conqueror. own
ims on our notice on his ready
ied out, the father had a , the
will, though not in de part
England.³ In the earl in his
against several revolts the
ot directly told what w ere at
s government; but we who
f revolts against a prin s so
ignty under circumstar ene-
erthrew all his domest ecial
not charged with any With
ent of his authority. as as
on the same friendly te but
n repudiated his homag l of
s In this warfare, Ni lish
liantly beaten off the E with
itin, appears side by side pre-
red⁶ raises the strongest Pal-
uen's
olas, seemingly illegitimate (rians
ionk, and died Abbot of Saint hand
e hard to say. The Norman hist abso-
and certainly, unless he had a most
is recorded of him. We hear ually
on his part as are recorded of
vi. 3. Roman de Rou. 7453-
p further, and makes Robert
331.
c.] superavit, avusque Britan
lla dedit." family
William of Belesme (of whose Ivy
eux, who was son of Rudolf of Will.
cousin to Robert's father. See
seqq.
7755 7896.
William of Jumièges. "Alvre
dus"

sumption of his English birth. The banishments of the earlier days of Cnut will easily account for so rare an event as that of an Englishman taking service under a foreign prince. But it was as the protector of unfortunate princes that Robert seems to have been most anxious to appear before the world. Baldwin of Flanders, driven from his dominions by his rebellious son, was restored by the power of the Norman Duke.¹ A still more exalted suppliant presently implored his help. His liege lord, Henry, King of the French, was reduced to claim the support of the mightiest of his vassals against foes who were of his own household. King Robert had originally designed the succession for his eldest son Hugh, whom, according to a custom common in France, though unusual in England, he caused to be crowned in his lifetime.² Hugh, a prince whose merits, we are told, were such that a party in Italy looked to him as a candidate for the Imperial Crown,³ was, after some disputes with his father, reconciled to him, and died before him. Robert then selected as his successor his second son Henry, who was already invested with the Duchy of Burgundy. Henry was accordingly accepted and crowned at Rheims.⁴ But the arrangement displeased

CHAP. VI.

He restores
Baldwin of
Flanders.

King Ro-
bert and
his sons.

Hugh is
crowned
and dies
before him.

Henry
crowned in
his father's
lifetime.

is the form by which he expresses the English Ætheling Ælfred. In the *Roman de Rou* he is "Auvere," "Alverei," "Alvere;" the Ætheling is "Auvered" and "Alvred." Ælfred can hardly fail to be the name intended. And an Ælfred in that generation can hardly fail to have been an Englishman, unless any one is inclined to trace up the use of the name to the Saxon settlement at Bayeux. M. Pluquet in a note on the *Roman de Rou* says that the name is still common in the Bessin. Ælfred became a monk at Cerisy. *Roman de Rou*, 8717 et seqq.

¹ Will. Gem. vi. 6. The younger Baldwin had married Adela, daughter of King Robert and the nominal widow of Duke Richard the Third.

² Rud. Glaber, iii. 9 (Duchesne, iv. 36).

³ Ib. "Hujusmodi enim fama ubique provinciarum percitus peroptabatur à multis, præcipuè ab Italicis, ut sibi imperaret, in Imperium sublimari." If there is any truth in this rumour, the date may be fixed to the year 1022, when the Empire was vacant by the death of Henry the First or Second.

⁴ Ib. p. 37.

CHAP. VI. Queen Constance, who was bent on the promotion of her third son Richard. On King Robert's death, Constance and Richard expelled Henry, who took refuge with his Norman vassal, and was restored by his help, Richard being allowed to receive his brother's Duchy of Burgundy.¹ The policy of Hugh the Great had indeed won for his house an efficient protector in the descendant of the pirates.

Death of King Robert. Henry expelled, and restored by Duke Robert. 1031.

The English Æthelings in Normandy. But there were other banished princes who had a nearer claim upon Duke Robert than his Flemish neighbour, a nearer personal claim than even his Lord at Paris. The English Æthelings, his cousins Eadward and Ælfred, were still at his court, banished from the land of their fathers, while the Danish invader occupied their ancestral throne. Their mother had wholly forgotten them; their uncle had made no effort on their behalf; Robert, their cousin, was the first kinsman to whom it appeared to be any part of his business to assert their right to a crown which seemed to have hopelessly passed away from their house. That Robert did make an attempt to restore them, that the relations between him and Cnut were unfriendly on other grounds, there seems no reason to doubt. But when we ask for dates and details, we are at once plunged into every

Contradictory evidence as to the relations between Cnut and Robert.

¹ Rudolf (iii. 9) seems to know nothing of the Norman intervention, but attributes the reconciliation to the mediation of Fulk of Anjou. The Norman story is given in Will. Gem. vi. 7. Roman de Rou, 7685-7752. See also the Tours Chronicle, ap. Duchesne, iii. 361, and Will. Malms. i. 187. But both these writers confound Henry's brothers in a strange way. They say that the eldest brother Odo did not succeed because of his incapacity; "quia stultus erat;" "Odo major natu hebes." Now Robert had a son Odo, who seems to have answered the description thus given, but he was the fourth in order of birth; "Odo verò frater eorum privatus permansit." Chron. ap. Duchesne, iii. 86. The Tours writer also makes Constance favour Henry, but both distinctly recognize the action of Robert; "Henricus regnavit auxilio matris et Roberti Ducis Normanniæ." So William of Malmesbury; "Henricus, maximè annitente Roberto Normanno, coronatus est priusquam planè pater exspirasset." Even here there is a confusion between Henry's coronation and his restoration by Robert.

sort of confusion and contradiction. The English writers CHAP. VI. are silent; from the German writers we learn next to nothing; the Scandinavian history of this age is still at least half mythical; the Norman writers never held truth to be any consequence whenever the relations of Normandy and England were concerned. That Robert provoked Cnut by threats or attempts to restore the Æthelings, and also by ill-treating and repudiating Cnut's sister, seem to be facts which we may accept in the bare outline, whatever we say as to their minuter circumstances. That Cnut retaliated by an invasion of Normandy, or that the threat of such an invasion had an effect on the conduct of the sovereigns of Normandy, are positions which are strongly asserted by various authorities. But their stories are accompanied by circumstances which directly contradict the witness of authorities which are far more trustworthy. In fact, the moment we get beyond the range of the sober contemporary Chronicles of our own land, we find ourselves in a region in which the mythical and romantic elements outweigh the historical, and moreover, in whatever comes from Norman sources, we have to be on our guard against interested invention as well as against honest error.

We have seen that Estrith, a sister of Cnut, was married to the Danish Earl Ulf, the brother-in-law of Godwine, to whom she bore the famous Swend Estrithson, afterwards King of the Danes, one of the most renowned princes in Danish history. We are told by a variety of authorities that, besides her marriage with Ulf, Estrith was married to the Duke of the Normans,¹ that she was ill-treated by him in

Marriages
of Estrith
with Ulf
and Robert.

¹ The Norman and English writers do not mention the marriage of Robert and Estrith. It is asserted by Saxo, Adam of Bremen, and Rudolf Glaber. But the two former tell the story with much confusion, making Estrith marry, not Robert, but Richard. They both connect this marriage with Cnut's own marriage with Emma. Saxo's words (p. 193) are; "Quum Anglorum rebus obtentis nectendam cum finitimis amicitiam decrevisset, Normanniæ Præfecti [an odd title] *Roberti* filiam Immam

CHAP. VI. various ways, and was finally sent back with ignominy to her brother. The majority of writers who tell this story place this marriage before her marriage with Ulf, and make the Danish Earl take the divorced wife of the Norman Duke. With this story several writers connect another, of an invasion, or threatened invasion, of Normandy by Cnut in order to redress his sister's wrongs. The most popular Danish writer even makes Cnut die, in contradiction to all authentic history, while besieging Rouen.¹ We read also how the Norman Duke fled to

Supposed
wars be-
tween Cnut
and Robert.

matrimonio duxit, *ejusque fratri Rikardo sororem Estritham conjugio potendam permisit.*" The utter confusion of Saxo's ideas about the Norman Dukes is manifest. Adam (ii. 52) says ; "Chnud regnum Adalradi accepit, uxoremque ejus Imnam nomine, quæ fuit soror Comitis Nortmannorum Rikardi. Cui Rex Danorum suam dedit germanam Margaretam pro foedere. Quam deinde Chnut, repudiatam à Comite, Wolf Duci Angliæ dedit. . . . Et Rikardus quidem Comes, declinans iram Chnut, Jherosolimam profectus, ibidem obiit, relinquens filium in Nortmanniâ nomine Rodbertum, cujus filius est iste Willelmus, quem Franci Bastardum vocant." Here we get a little light. The marriages of Richard the Good with Judith and Papia are well ascertained, and there is no room left for a marriage with Estrith. But, as Dr. Lappenberg remarks (479. Eng. Tr. ii. 217), Adam's mention of the pilgrimage to Jerusalem shows that Robert is the person really meant among all this confusion. Lastly, Rudolf Glaber, a better authority than either Saxo or Adam, steps in to settle the matter. He describes (iv. 6. p. 47) Robert's pilgrimage to Jerusalem and his death without lawful issue, "*quamlibet sororem Anglorum Regis Canuc manifestum est duxisse uxorem, quam odiendo divortium fecerat.*" This seems to put the fact of a marriage between Robert and Estrith on firm ground. Among the Danish annalists, the Esrom Annals (Lang. i. 236) simply copy Adam of Bremen ; those of Roskild (Lang. i. 377) tell the same tale in different words ; "*Kanutus victor existens, ipsam Ymmam duxit uxorem, genuitque ex eâ filium Hartheknud. Kanutus Ricardo suam dedit sororem nomine Estrid. Quæ ab illo repudiata Duci Ulf sine fratris consensu est conjuncta.*" The name Margaret given by Adam to this princess is remarkable. Estrith, like Emma and Eadgyth (see above, p. 334), might have been required to take a Norman name at the Norman court. But why Margaret? We have as yet no Norman Margarets, nor perhaps any Western Margarets at all, till the return of Eadward the son of Eadmund from Hungary.

¹ Saxo seems to make two Norman expeditions on the part of Cnut. First (p. 194), early in his reign, so far as anything can be made out of Saxo's chronology ; "*Rikardum acerrimum uxoris csorem effectum, patriâ*

Jerusalem or elsewhere for fear of the anger of the Lord of six Northern Kingdoms. Details of this sort are plainly mythical; but they point to some real quarrel, to some war, threatened if not actually waged, between Cnut and Robert. And chronology, as well as the tone of the legends, shows that the whole of these events must be placed quite late in Cnut's reign. The natural inference is that the marriage between Robert and Estrith took place, not before her marriage with Ulf, but after Ulf's death.¹ The widow was richly endowed; her brother had atoned for the slaughter of her husband by territorial grants which might well have moved the cupidity of the Norman.² A superior attraction nearer his own castle may easily account for Robert's neglect of his Scandinavian bride. Three years

CHAP. VI.

Robert
probably
married
Estrith
after Ulf's
death.
c. 1026.

exegit." Afterwards (pp. 200, 201) we have the story of his great expedition and death before Rouen. Richard is still Duke, but, for fear of Cnut, he flees to Sicily; "Cujus [Canuti] impetum Richardus Siciliam petens, fugâ præcurrere maturavit." The mention of Sicily is of course suggested by the exploits of the Normans in those regions. Adam, as we have seen, makes Richard flee to Jerusalem. His Scholiast adds that the conquest of Apulia was begun by forty of his comrades on their return. The source of confusion is obvious.

We have seen a French campaign and a visit to Rouen attributed to Cnut by Swend Aggeßon (see above, p. 504), but the circumstances are quite different.

¹ So Lappenberg (ii. 217), and Pertz in his note to Adam, ii. 52. A dispute between Robert and Cnut which could be connected, even mythically, with Cnut's death and Robert's pilgrimage must be placed quite late in their reigns. And as the offender is always looked on as the reigning Duke, 1028, or (if we take the reckoning of Florence under 1026 and the Peterborough Chronicle under 1024) 1026, is the earliest year to which the transaction can be referred. Ulf was killed in 1025. William the Bastard was born in 1028.

² Saxo at least tells us that Cnut, before her marriage with Ulf, "sororem Sialandiæ redditam regiarum partium functione donavit" (p. 194). After Ulf's death, execution, or murder, "Canutus violatæ necessitudinis injuriam, ac sororis viduitatem, duarum provinciarum attributione pensavit" (p. 197). He adds that she gave them to the Church of Roskild. The Roskild Annals (Lang. i. 377) make her rebuild the church of stone, it having been before of wood; "Honorificè sepelivit, ecclesiamque lapideam in loco lignæ construxit, quam multis modis ditavit."

CHAP. VI. after Estrith's widowhood, Robert became him who was preeminently the Bastard.

Robert's
intervention
on be-
half of the
Æthelings.
1028-1035.

It seems impossible to doubt that Robert's intervention on behalf of his English cousins was connected with these events. The reign of Robert coincides with the last seven years of the reign of Cnut, so that any intervention of Robert in English affairs must have been in Cnut's later days.¹ Each prince would doubtless seize every opportunity of annoying the other; the tale clearly sets Robert before us as the aggressor; but, as to the order of events, we are left to guess. It would be perfectly natural, in a violent and impulsive character such as Robert seems to have been,² if the repudiation of Estrith was accompanied, or presently followed, by the assertion of the claims of the Æthelings to her brother's crown. The date then of the first contemplated Norman invasion of England can be fixed only within a few years; but the story, as we read it in the Norman accounts, seems credible enough in its general outline.³ The Duke sends an embassy to Cnut, demanding, it would seem, the cession of the whole Kingdom of England to the rightful heir.⁴ That Cnut refused

¹ Two English writers only speak of Robert's designs on England, namely William of Malmesbury and John of Wallingford. John (ap. Gale, 549-50) tells the story much as William of Jumièges does, only, with the usual confusion, he substitutes Richard the Good for Robert. But it is clear from the two Williams that Robert was the Duke concerned, so that John of Wallingford is clearly wrong when he places the story in the first years of Cnut—"in primordiis regni sui."

² The character of Robert, as I hinted before, is a problem. Setting aside the charge of fratricide, his actions give one the impression of his being much such a character as his ancestor William Longsword (see above, p. 215). His conduct in the external relations of his Duchy was far more honourable than that of William; but then he had no Hugh of Paris or Herbert of Vermandois to lead him astray.

³ Will. Gem. vi. 10, 11. Roman de Rou, 7897 et seqq. Joh. Wallingford, u. s. Will. Malms. ii. 180. The last writer however mentions only the attempted invasion, and says nothing of the embassies before and after.

⁴ Will. Gem. vi. 10. "Mandavit Chunuto Regi, ut jamjamque satiatum eorum exterminio illis parceret, et sua eis vel serò pro sui amoris obtentu

to surrender his crown is nothing wonderful, though the Norman writer seems shocked that the exhortation of the Norman ambassadors did not at once bring conviction to the mind of the usurper.¹ The Duke then, in great wrath, determines to assert the claims of his kinsmen by force of arms. An Assembly of the Normans is held, a forerunner of the more famous Assembly at Lillebonne, in which the invasion of England is determined on. A fleet is prepared with all haste, and Duke Robert and the Ætheling Eadward² embark at Fécamp. But the wind was contrary; instead of being carried safely to Pèvensey, the fleet was carried round the Côtentin peninsula and found itself on the coast of Jersey.³ All attempts were vain; the historian piously adds that they were frustrated by a special Providence, because God had determined that his servant Eadward should make his way to the English Crown without the shedding of blood.⁴ The Duke accordingly gave up his enterprise on behalf of his cousin of England, and

CHAP. VI.
Robert's
unsuccess-
ful attempt
to invade
England.

redderet." So John of Wallingford; "Venerunt legati à Normanniâ . . . qui cum Cnutone de regni jure disceptantes juvenibus prædictis regnum postulabant."

¹ Will. Gem. vi. 10. "Ille salubribus monitis ejus non adquevit, sed legatos infectis rebus nihil lætum portantes remisit."

² William of Jumièges implies the personal presence of the Duke on board the fleet, but says nothing of that of the Ætheling. Wace mentions both "Robert et Edward" (7941).

³ "Nimiâ tempestate acti ad insulam quæ *Gersus* vocatur," says William of Jumièges. "*Gersus*" is a singular form for an island which is also called *Cæsarea*. Sir F. Palgrave (iii. 176) remarks that this is the first time that Jersey is spoken of in mediæval history. Wace (7937) seems to have thought that a special description of the geography of the island was needed.

"Gersui est prez de Costentin,
Là ù Normendie prent fin;
En mer est devers occident,
Al fiè de Normendie appent."

⁴ Will. Gem. vi. 10. "Quod puto ita factum esse, Deo auctore, pro Edwardo Rege, quem disponebat in futuro regnare sine sanguinis effusione." William of Malmesbury is vaguer and more discreet; "per occultum scilicet Dei judicium, in cujus voluntate sunt potestates regnorum omnium."

CHAP. VI. employed his fleet in a further harrying of the dominions of his cousin of Brittany.¹ At last Robert, Archbishop of Rouen, the common uncle of Robert and Alan,² reconciled the two princes, and the fleet apparently now sailed to Rouen.³ Thus far we have a story, somewhat heightened in details, but which may be taken as evidence that Robert, who had restored the fugitive sovereigns of France and Flanders, really contemplated carrying on his calling of King-maker beyond the sea. Robert, a thorough knight-errant, probably contemplated the restoration of his cousin in perfect good faith, and with no more intention of any ulterior gain to himself than he had shown in the restorations of Baldwin and Henry. But, if a Norman army had once landed in England, it would not have been so easy to bring it home again as to bring home one which had simply marched into France or Flanders. Cnut, with no Tostig, no Harold Hardrada, to divert him from the main danger, and with the force of his other Kingdoms ready to back him, would most likely have speedily crushed the invader. But had it been otherwise, one can hardly fancy the English expedition producing no more lasting results than the French and Flemish expedition. If a Norman army had effected the restoration of the Ætheling, it could hardly have failed to do somewhat more than effect his restoration. Had Eadward ascended the English throne by virtue of a victory won by Norman troops over Cnut's Danes and Englishmen, the practical aspect of such a revolution could have hardly differed at all from the revolution which did take place under William. The prince thus established in his Kingdom would have been, according to formal pedigrees, the *cyne-hlaford*, the descendant of

Probable results of the success of such an invasion.

¹ Will. Gem. vi. 11.

² Ib.

³ William of Malmesbury winds up his story with the singular statement; "Reliquiæ ratium, multo tempore dissolutarum, Rotomagi adhuc nostrâ ætate visebantur."

Ælfred, Cerdic, and Woden. But, half-Norman by birth, wholly Norman in feeling, raised to his throne by Norman swords, Eadward would have reigned still more completely as a Frenchman than he did reign when, a few years later, he came to the Crown in a more peaceable way. The storm, or whatever it was, which kept back Robert the Devil from his scheme of an invasion of England, put off the chances of a Norman Conquest for nearly forty years.

The Norman writers wind up their story with an assertion which is much less credible than their account of the expedition itself. Robert, on his return from his Breton expedition, was met, in the very nick of time,¹ by ambassadors from Cnut offering half of the Kingdom of England to the sons of Æthelred. The Lord of Northern Europe was sick, and felt himself near his end; he therefore wished for peace during the remnant of his days.² Of course this is not to be understood as an offer of immediate resignation of any part of his dominions. What is meant is that Cnut offered to secure peace with Normandy by recognizing Eadward as his successor in the Kingdom of Wessex. The Norman and the Danish accounts may be set against one another. Any number of embassies may have passed between the two princes, any amount of mutual threatenings may have been exchanged; but Cnut's fear of Robert and Robert's fear of Cnut may be set aside as equally mythical. The Norman story is utterly improbable. Nothing could be more unlikely than a disposition made by Cnut in favour of either of his step-sons.

Cnut said to have offered the succession of Wessex to the Æthelings.

Improbability of the story.

¹ Will. Gem. vi. 12. "Quibus ad liquidum sopitis, en, adsunt legati Roberto Duci à Chunuto Rege directi."

² Ib. "Pace ratâ in diebus suis eò quod validâ gravaretur incommoditate corporali." So John of Wallingford (550); "Quâdam molestiâ tactus Cnuto, et sibi et causæ suæ timuit, et sub quotidianâ formidine discidium et periculum, quod ex parte illâ imminere sensit, studuit terminare." No doubt these writers fancied Cnut, who died at the age of forty, to have been quite an old man. Cf. above, p. 280.

NISH KINGS IN ENGLAND.

personal motive for alienating an-
om his own children. In al-
ence of his wife would supply
e for such an arrangement.

ma leads us to believe that h-
was centered on Harthacnut a-
as not at all likely to use her
by Ethelred. And had Cnut

favour of Eadward or Ælfred,
o leave some trace in English
s which immediately followe-

ear not a word of their claims-
le voice raised in their favou-
een the distortion of somethin-

We must not forget that Ha-
no less than Eadward. It is
ment or confirmation of Cnut

is opposed to the succession of
been made by Cnut to the
nouncement might easily ha-

n writers, ill-informed about
ion in favour of another son of

ations between Cnut and Robe-
princes died in the same year.²
im to Rome, on an errand, of

re doubtless the predominating
knew how to make use of the
his soul in order to advance

credit and the interests of th-
he ruled. A fit of purer

do not look on a single expression of Wi-
vidence enough to prove the existence of
is Æthelings.

Will. Gem. vi. 13. So Florence in ann-
ury Chronicles place his death in 1031.

portion

ost any

natural

But all

whole

d Gun-

ffluence

ade any

could

istory.

on the

ve bear

Still

which

hacnut

ossible

inten-

Harold

orman

e been

nglish

mma.

t may

Cnut

which

cause,

urney

t once

arious

igious

liam of

a party

. The

enthusiasm, a fierce impulse of penitence for past sins, carried Robert the Devil on the more distant pilgrimage to Jerusalem.¹ On his return he died at the Bithynian Nikaia, some say by the same fate by which he was suspected of having made away with his own brother.² In his lifetime he had begun to rear the noble Abbey of Cerisy, which, after many changes and mutilations, still remains to witness to the severe grandeur of the taste of Robert and his age.³ But the bones of its founder were not destined to rest among its massive pillars or beneath the bold arches which span the width of its stately nave. The relics which he had collected in the East were borne by his chamberlain Toustain to the sanctuary which he had founded,⁴ but the great Duke of the Normans⁵ himself found his last home in the lands beyond the Hellespont, beneath the spreading cupolas of a Byzantine basilica at Nikaia.⁶ The Norman thus died a stranger and a pilgrim in a land of another tongue and another worship; the Dane too ended his days in a land which was not his by birth; but it was a land in which, if he had entered it as a destroyer, he had truly reigned as a father. Cnut, Emperor of six Kingdoms, but in a special manner King of the West-Saxon realm, died within the West-

Robert dies
at Nikaia.
July 2,
1035.

Cnut dies
at Shaftes-
bury.
November
12, 1035.

¹ See William of Jumièges, vi. 12, who however does not distinctly connect the pilgrimage with the death of his brother. But William of Malmesbury says distinctly; "*cujus rei gemens conscientiam.*" So the Tours Chronicle quoted above (p. 517); "*Quare . . . nudipes Hierusalem abiit.*"

² Will. Malms. ii. 178. "*Apud Nicæam urbem Bithyniæ dies implevit, veneno, ut fertur, interceptus; auctore ministro Radulfo, cognomento Mowino, qui scelus illud spe ducatûs animo suo extorserit; sed Normaniam regressus, re cognita, ab omnibus quasi monstrum exsufflatus, in exilium perpetuum discessit.*" So Roman de Rou, 8372.

³ Will. Gem. vii. 22. "*At Robertus . . . antequam Hierusalem pergeret, monasterium Sancti Vigoris Ceratii ædificare cœpit.*" So Roman de Rou, 7465 et seqq., 8390. On Cerisy, see Neustria Pia, 429.

⁴ Roman de Rou, 8391.

⁵ Will. Gem. vii. 1. "*Roberti magni Ducis.*"

⁶ Ib. vi. 13. "*Sepultus est etiam in basilicâ Sanctæ Mariæ à suis, intra mœnia Nicenæ civitatis.*"

CHAP. VI. Saxon border, at a spot hallowed by memories of the Great Ælfred, beneath the shadow of his minster at Shaftesbury.¹ As an English King by adoption, if not by birth, he found a grave among the English Kings who went before him, in the Old Minster of his West-Saxon capital. The two rivals, if rivals they were, passed from the Western world almost at the same moment; the death of Cnut happened about the time when the death of Robert could have become known in England or in Normandy. The dominions of both rulers passed away to their spurious or doubtful offspring. The son of Arlette succeeded in Normandy; the supposed son of "the other Ælfgifu" succeeded in England. But, if there be a wide difference between the fame of the two fathers, it is far more than overbalanced by the difference between the fame of their sons. A reign of a few obscure years of crime and confusion forms the sole memory of the Bastard of Northampton, while the world has ever since rung, and while it lasts, can hardly ever fail to ring, with the mighty name of the Bastard of Falaise.

Contrast
between
their suc-
cessors.

§ 2. *The Reign of Harold the Son of Cnut.*

1035-1040.

Extent
of Cnut's
Empire.

The good fortune of Cnut had raised him up an Empire in Northern Europe to which there was no parallel before or after him. Setting aside descriptions of his power which are manifestly gross exaggerations, he united the Kingdom of England and its dependencies with the Kingdoms of Denmark and Norway. As to his intentions with regard to the disposition of these vast dominions after his

¹ The death of Cnut at Shaftesbury is asserted by all the Chronicles and Florence in anno, and by William of Malmesbury, ii. 187. Of Saxo's wild fable about his death at Rouen I have spoken already. I have not found it in any other of the Danish writers, several of whom distinctly assert his death in England. Chron. Esom. ap. Lang. i. 236 (which makes him die in 1037). Chron. Rosk. i. 377.

death our information is unfortunately most meagre. It seems clear that, like Charles the Great, he contemplated a partition among his children;¹ it is not clear whether, like Charles, he contemplated the retention of any kind of connexion among his various Kingdoms, or the investiture of one among his sons with any sort of Imperial superiority over the others. Like Charles, he had established his sons as Kings during his lifetime in his subordinate Kingdoms. I say subordinate Kingdoms, because nothing can be plainer than that, in Cnut's eyes, Denmark and Norway were little more than dependencies of England. England was the seat of his own dominion, while the Scandinavian Kingdoms were entrusted to Viceroys or under-Kings. Swend, with his mother Ælfgifu, had reigned in Norway; Denmark, it would seem, had been placed at one time under Harold and at another under Harthacnut.² In both countries we see signs of dis-

CHAP. VI.

Comparison between the partition of the Empire of Cnut and that of Charles.

England the centre of Cnut's Empire.

The Scandinavian States ruled by under-Kings.

¹ Charles' schemes of partition came to nothing, because of the death of his sons Charles and Pippin. Still a trace of them remained in the position of Bernard, son of Pippin, as King of Italy under the Emperor Lewis. The whole reign of Lewis, I need hardly say, is one long record of partitions and contemplated partitions of the Empire.

² Saxo is so confused in his chronology that it is difficult to say whether, in the following passage (p. 196), he may not be confounding the division of Cnut's dominions after his death with a system of under-Kings during his life-time. But his words certainly describe a state of things very like that which was contemplated by Charles. "Inde [from Rome, see above, p. 504] reversus, Haraldum natu majorem Angliæ, Daniæ Canutum, Norvagiæ Svenonem, quem ex Alvinâ sustulerat, absque ullâ majestatis suæ diminutione, præfecit. Nam etsi tres provincias totidem filiorum regimini tradidit, nihilominus commune sibi trium *imperium* reservavit, neque summam penes alium consistere voluit. Præterea teneris adhuc ducibus, in officiorum tutelam fortissimorum præsidia sociavit." The Knytlinga Saga (c. 17. Ant. Celto-Scandicæ, p. 144) gives a similar account, only instead of England, it makes Harold under-King over part of Scotland. "Knutr Konungr hafdi oc til forrada mikinn hlut af Skotlandi, oc sette hann þar Haralld son sinn Konung ysir; enu þo var Knutr Konungr ysir-konungr [Overkonge] allra þeirra." There is however not the slightest evidence that Harold ever reigned in England as under-King, and a reign in Scotland, though the statement is very remarkable, is hardly to be as-

CHAP. VI. affection towards Cnut's government, of which we see no trace in England. The rule of Swend and his mother is said to have been highly oppressive in Norway.¹ In Denmark we even hear of an attempt, headed by Earl Ulf and said to be favoured by Queen Emma, to displace Cnut in favour of Harthacnut.² The reason assigned is the preference shown by Cnut to England and Englishmen.³ If then Cnut entertained any idea of permanently annexing his Scandinavian possessions to his English Empire, any idea, in short, of reducing Denmark and Norway to the condition of Wales and Scotland, such schemes had very little chance of succeeding for any length of time. To retain Wales and Scotland, conterminous countries, in any permanent subjection was always difficult; to retain countries so remote as Denmark and Norway was hopelessly impossible. Empires like those of Alexander, Charles, or Cnut are in their own nature ephemeral. As in the case of Alexander and Charles, the process of their formation may leave behind it results affecting the whole later history of the world, but the Empires themselves are ephemeral. As united dominions, swayed by a single will, they last only as long as there is an Alexander or a Charles at their head; they fall to pieces as soon as the sceptre of the great conqueror passes into weaker hands. So it was with the Anglo-Scandinavian Empire of the Great Cnut. With our scanty information, we cannot positively either assert or deny that he dreamed of preserving union in any shape among his vast and widely severed dominions. If he did entertain such thoughts, his designs were scattered to the winds immediately upon his own death. When he

Impossibility of retaining the connexion between England and Scandinavia

Ephemeral nature of such Empires in general.

Cnut's designs not carried out

sumed without better authority than that of the *Knytlinga Saga*. On Harold's apparent reign in Denmark, see above, p. 474. On Swend's reign in Norway with his mother *Ælfgifu*, see Snorre, c. 252 (Laing, ii. 344).

¹ Snorre, c. 252, 261 (Laing, ii. 344, 353).

² Snorre, c. 168 (Laing, ii. 244).

³ See Mallet, *Histoire du Danemarck*, iii. 137.

died, Swend was in possession of Norway, and Harthacnut in possession of Denmark. It appears that England also was designed for the son of Emma, Cnut's specially royal offspring, the one son who was the child of a crowned King and his Lady. What provision, if any, was made for Harold by his father's last dispositions, does not appear. But things turned out far differently from what Cnut had intended. Swend was almost immediately driven out of Norway, and Magnus, the son of Saint Olaf, was received as King.¹ In Denmark Harthacnut retained possession, though the aspect of Magnus was threatening. In England, as usual, all attempts to influence the free choice of the Witan before the vacancy came to nothing. If Cnut attempted to do more than exercise that vague power of recommending a successor which the Law vested in him, his bequest counted for as little as the older bequests of Æthelwulf had counted.²

CHAP. VI.

Swend
expelled
from
Norway.
1036.

The events which immediately followed the death of Cnut are told with much contradiction and confusion; but, by closely attending to the most trustworthy authorities, it seems not very difficult to make out the general sequence of events.³ It appears then that the will of

State of
England
on the
death of
Cnut.

¹ Snorre, Saga of Magnus, c. 4 (Laing, ii. 363). As to the division after Cnut's death, see Adam of Bremen, ii. 72; "*Post cujus mortem. ut ipse disposuit, succedunt in regnum filii ejus, Haroldus in Angliam, Svein in Nortmanniam, Hardechnut autem in Daniam. . . . Suein et Harold, à concubinâ geniti erant; qui, ut mos est barbaris, æquam tunc inter liberos Chnut sortiti sunt partem hæreditatis.*" This is copied by the Esrom Chronicle, Lang. i. 237. cf. Chron. Rosk. p. 377. Chron. Erics, p. 159. As Harold actually succeeded in England, foreign writers seem to have taken for granted that his succession was in accordance with Cnut's will.

² See above, p. 118.

³ The cause of all these difficulties and contradictions seems to be that the division of the Kingdom between Harold and Harthacnut proved a mere ephemeral arrangement, and was set aside within two years. It seems therefore to have quite passed out of mind, except with the very few writers with whom minute accuracy was really an object. No one would find out the fact from Adam of Bremen, from the Encomiast, or even from William of Malmesbury. Of the Danish writers it is needless to speak.

CHAP. VI.
The West-
Saxons for
Hartha-
cnut.

Northum-
berland,
Mercia, and
London for
Harold.

the late King, in favour of Harthacnut, was supported by the West-Saxons with Godwine their Earl at their head. That the English were divided, some being for Harthacnut and some for one of the sons of Æthelred, is a statement which seems hardly to rest on sufficient authority.¹ On the other hand, Harold, the supposed son of Cnut and of Ælfgifu of Northampton, also appeared as a candidate. He was apparently supported by Earl Leofric of Mercia, by the great body of the Thegns north of the Thames, and by the "lithsmen," the sea-faring folk, of London. It would even seem that he ventured on an act, whether

The *Encomiast* (25 et seqq.) and, still more plainly, William of Malmesbury (ii. 188) realize that a strong opposition was made to the election of Harold; they do not realize that that opposition was so far successful that a temporary sovereignty over a part of the Kingdom was secured to Harthacnut. Even Florence, seemingly hesitating, as he sometimes does, between two versions of a story, tells the tale with some confusion. But on comparing the Abingdon, Worcester, and Peterborough Chronicles, the matter becomes much clearer. The Peterborough Chronicle is the primary authority for the division of parties in the Witenagemót, for the division of the Kingdom between the two competitors, for the Regency of Emma and Godwine on behalf of Harthacnut. Its statements are copied, with more or less of confusion and misconception, by the Canterbury Chronicle, Florence, and William. The Abingdon and Worcester Chronicles do not distinctly mention the division of the Kingdom under the year 1035; but they imply it under 1037, in the words, "Hér man geceas Harald ofer eall to cinge, and forsoc Harðacnut," which, unless Harthacnut had before possessed part of the Kingdom, would be meaningless. Oddly enough, the Peterborough Chronicle does not distinctly mention this second election of Harold, though it perhaps alludes to it in the words, "And he [Harold] wæs þæh full cyng ofer eall Engla-land." Thus the two accounts in the Chronicles fill up gaps in each other, and between the two we get a full and consistent narrative.

¹ See above, p. 528. William of Malmesbury indeed says (ii. 188), "*Angli diu obstiterunt, magis unum ex filiis Ethelredi, qui in Normanniâ morabantur, vel Hardecnutum filium Cnutonis ex Emma, qui tunc in Danemarchiâ erat, Regem habere volentes.*" But we hear nothing in the Chronicles, where the proceedings in the Witenagemót are described, of any voices being raised on the side of the Æthelings, and William himself says (u. s.) of a time a little later; "*Filii Ethelredi jam ferè omnibus respectui erant, magis propter paternæ socordis memoriam, quam propter Danorum potentiam.*" These last words are at least a witness to the freedom of election on this occasion.

we call it of sovereignty or of violence, before the election CHAP. VI.
 was held. He sent to Winchester and despoiled the Lady Harold
 Ælfgifu-Emma of the treasures which had been left her spoils
 by Cnut.¹ Personally, as the event proved, both can- Emma.
 didates were equally worthless; but each had strong
 political motives on his side, and it is clear that men's
 passions were deeply moved by the struggle. As far
 as we can see, Harold was the candidate of the North,
 Harthacnut of the South; Harold was the candidate of
 the Danes, Harthacnut of the English. At first sight Apparent
 this seems to be a division of parties exactly opposite to motives of
 what might have been expected. Harthacnut, the son of the two
 a Danish father and a Norman mother, had not a drop parties.
 of English blood in his veins. Harold, if he was what he
 professed to be, the son of Cnut by the other Ælfgifu,
 was English at least by the mother's side; if he was what
 scandal asserted him to be, the son of a shoemaker by
 some nameless mother, he was probably English on both
 sides. The election of Harthacnut involved the continua-
 tion of the connexion with Denmark; the election of
 Harold would again make England an independent and
 isolated monarchy. Yet English feeling lay with Hartha-
 cnut, Danish feeling lay with Harold. The explanation Attach-
 is probably to be found in the personal position of Cnut ment of
 towards his West-Saxon subjects. He had lived among the West-
 them; the greatest of living Englishmen had been his Saxons to
 minister and representative; he had in every way iden- Hartha-
 tified himself with them, and they had flourished under cnut as the
legatee of
Cnut.

¹ The accounts in the Abingdon and Worcester Chronicles, the only copies which mention the seizure, would seem to imply that it took place while Harold was still only a candidate for the Crown. Florence (in anno) indeed says, "Is tamen, *adeptū regiā dignitate*, misit Wintoniam suos constipatores celerrimè, et gazarum opumque quas Rex Canutus Algivæ reliquerat Reginæ majorem melioremque partem ademit illi tyrannicè." So Roger of Wendover, i. 473. But Harold could hardly have ventured on this after the peaceful division of the kingdom, and this business is quite different from Harold's expulsion of Emma in 1037, though it is confounded with it by Roger.

CHAP. VI. his government as they had never flourished before. It was no wonder then if the wishes of Cnut with regard to the succession or to anything else were looked on by the West-Saxon people as a sacred law. Harthacnut too, if not the descendant of their ancient rulers, was at least a kingly bairn, the son of a crowned King and his Lady. Who was Harold the bastard, whose parents no one knew for certain, that he should rule over them? If Harthacnut was at this moment in Denmark, his earliest days had been spent in England, while we have seen reason to believe that the earliest days of Harold had been spent in Denmark. The continued connexion with Denmark which was implied in the choice of Harthacnut might even appear to patriotic Englishmen as an argument in favour of the Danish King.¹ In the later days of Cnut the connexion with Denmark had taken a form which must have been distinctly gratifying to English, and, above all, to West-Saxon, national feeling. The Lord of all Northern Europe had worn his Imperial crown in the old West-Saxon capital; he had thence sent forth his Earls and his sons to govern his dependent realms of Denmark and Norway. As it had been in the days of Cnut, so men deemed that it would be in the days of Harthacnut. Denmark, like Mercia or Northumberland, would be only another Earldom whence homage, and perhaps tribute, would be paid to the Imperial court and the Imperial treasure-house at Winchester. The sons of Æthelred were strangers; no man in England had seen them since their childhood; their claims had been made the pretext for an intended foreign invasion; no sentiment attaching to their remoter ancestry could at all counterbalance the sentiment which attached to the undoubted, the royal, the chosen, son of the King who had given England nineteen years of peace, prosperity, and foreign dominion. West-

Aspect of
the con-
nexion with
Denmark.

¹ I believe there were people who, on the accession of her present Majesty, regretted the separation between England and Hannover!

CLAIMS OF THE CANDIDATES.

Saxon feeling therefore identified itself with loyalty to the undoubted son of the late King and to his declared will as to the succession. Godwine and all the men of the Earldom were for Harthacnut.

On the other hand, it is not hard to see how Harold might appeal to a very intelligible line of feeling in the minds of the Danish and half-Danish inhabitants of Northern England. His bastardy would be in their eyes no objection. Whether we look on his mother as a concubine or as bound to Cnut by an irregular or irregular marriage, her children would, according to the notions, be as fit to reign as the children of the Northumbrian lady. Indeed a powerful vein of Northumbrian sentiment might not unnaturally attach to the grandson of the murdered Earl Ælfhelm. Harold's election might be the overthrow of the West-Saxon dominion over the Danes and Angles; a day might seem to be coming in which Winchester would have to bow to York. And if the son of Ælfifu had thus a local connexion with Northumbria, he had also a local connexion with Mercia. Whether by birth, by residence, or by maternal descent, the daughter of Ælfhelm was in some way Ælfifu of Northampton and her son might call on Mercian local feeling to support the claims of a countryman. Again, if Harold, once designed for the crown of Denmark and brought up in Denmark as a future Danish King, had been deprived of his father's later dispositions of any share in either England or Denmark, Danish and Northumbrian feelings would centre round him still more strongly. He would become the embodiment of any jealousies which had been called forth by Cnut's open preference of England to Denmark and of the Saxon part of England to the Anglian and Danish provinces. It was better to have a King who should reign over England without Denmark, better to have a King who should reign over Northumberland and Mercia without Wessex, than for a West-Saxon King, of whatever

ancestry, to hold both Denmark and Northumberland as dependencies. The old provincial feelings, often concealed but never completely stifled, ever ready to break out on any strong provocation, now broke out in their fulness. The Danish provinces sided with Harold. And with them we find a new element, the "lithsmen," the native multitude, of London. The great city still retained her voice in the election of Kings, but that voice would almost seem to have been transferred to a new class among her population. We hear now not of the citizens, but of the sea-faring men.¹ Every invasion, every foreign settlement of any kind within the Kingdom has, in every age, added a new element to the population of London. As a Norman colony settled in London later in the century, so a Danish colony settled there now. Some accounts tell us, doubtless with great exaggeration, that London had now become almost a Danish city.² But it is certain that the Danish element in the city was numerous and powerful, and that its voice strongly helped to swell the cry in favour of Harold. Northumberland, Mercia, and London thus demanded that the son of Ælfifu of Northampton should, if possible, be King over all England; in the worst case he should, like Eadgar and like Cnut, be King over all Northumberland and Mercia. There was perhaps in that age no country except England in which such a question could have been decided except at the cost of a civil war. But the firmly rooted principles of English Law, the habit of constant meeting and discussion, had, even in that age, produced some germs of

¹ There is now no mention of the "burhwaru," as at the election of Eadmund in 1016. The only Chronicle, that of Peterborough, which mentions the agency of London at all, speaks only of the "lithsmen." William of Malmesbury, seemingly not marking this distinction, says (ii. 188), "Elegerunt eum [Haroldum] Dani et Londonie oives, qui jam penè in barbarorum mores propter frequentem convictum transierant." Cf. Liagard, i. 318, who identifies the Lithsmen and the Thingmanns.

² Will. Malms. u. s.

Danish
settlement
in London.

the feeling to which the great English historian of Greece has given the name of "constitutional morality."¹ The controversy was a sharp one, but it was decided, not on the field of battle, but in the debates of the Witenagemót. The usual Midwinter meeting may, or may not, have been forestalled by a few weeks; certain it is that, soon after the death of Cnut, the Witan of all England met in full Gemót at Oxford. That town was, no doubt, on this as on other occasions, recommended for the purpose by its position on the frontiers of the two great divisions of the Kingdom. The National Council proceeded to debate the claims of the two candidates. The great Earl of the West-Saxons, supported by the whole force of his Earldom, strove to play the same part which Dunstan had played in the last recorded debate of the kind in a full and free Assembly of the Wise.² His eloquent tongue set forth the claims of Harthacnut, the candidate recommended alike by undoubted royal birth and by the wishes of the glorious sovereign whom they had lost. But this time the charmer charmed in vain. All that Godwine could gain for the son of the Lady was a portion of his father's Kingdom. The proposal of a division seems to have come from Leofric, now Earl over all Mercia,³ who on all occasions appears as a mediator between the extreme parties of the North and the South. To this course he was prompted alike by his personal temper and by the geographical position of his Earldom. Godwine and his party withstood for a while even this proposal; but the majority was against them; the assembly voted the division of England between the two candidates.⁴ Once more, but now for the last time in English

CHAP. VI.

The controversy peacefully decided in the Witenagemót. Gemót of Oxford. Christmas, 1035?

Godwine maintains the claims of Harthacnut.

The division of the Kingdom proposed by Leofric,

and voted by the Assembly.

¹ Grote's History of Greece, iv. 205.

² See above, p. 292.

³ See above, p. 461.

⁴ I understand the proposal for a division to come from Harold's supporters, most probably from Leofric, the natural mediator between the two extreme parties. I do not see what else can be the meaning of the expres-

CHAP. VI. history, the land had two acknowledged Kings. Harold
 Hartha-
 cnut reigns
 in Wessex;
 Harold
 reigns
 north of
 Thames,
 seemingly
 as superior
 Lord.

reigned to the North of the Thames and Harthacnut to the South. We are not distinctly told whether the two Kings were to be perfectly independent of each other, or whether, as in the case of Cnut and Eadmund, any Imperial supremacy was reserved to either of the half-brothers.¹ But several indications seem to show that such a supremacy was reserved to Harold, and such a supposition may perhaps help to explain some of the difficulties in the narrative which follows.² Nor are we

sion in the Peterborough Chronicle that Leofric and others chose Harold *and Harthacnut* ("Leofric Eorl and mæst ealle þa þegenas be norðan Temese and þa liðsmen on Lunden gecuron Harold to healdes ealles Englelandes; him and his broðer Hardacnute, þe wæs on Denemearcon"). This proposal—namely the division—Godwine and the West-Saxons resist ("and Godwine Eorl and ealle þa yldestan menn on West-Seaxon lagon ongean, swa hi lengost mihton; ac hi ne mihton nan þing ongean wealcen"); that is, they claim the whole Kingdom for Harthacnut. At last they are obliged to consent to the division and the regency ("and man gærædde þa þæt Ælfgifu Hardacnutes modor sæte on Winceastre mid þæs cynges huscarlum hyra suna, and beoldan ealle West-Seaxan him to handa; and Godwine Eorl was heora healdest man"). Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 758 B) translates this account, but he was evidently puzzled by the words about electing Harold *and Harthacnut*, as he says, "elegerunt Haraldum, ut conservaret regnum fratri suo Hardecnut;" a most unlikely story. The last clause he translates; "Consilium ergo inierunt quod Emma Regina cum Regis defuncti familiâ [huscarlum ?] conservaret Westsexe apud Winceastre in opus filii sui, Godwinus vero Consul dux eis esset in re militari." Henry says nothing of the second election of Harold in 1037. William of Malmesbury (ii. 188), though telling the story in a most confused way, seems quite to take in the position of Godwine; "Maximus tum justitiæ propugnator fuit Godwinus Comes, qui etiam pupillorum [he has some notion about the sons of Æthelred, as well as Harthacnut, see above, pp. 528, 534] se tutorem professus, reginam Emmam et regias gazas custodiens, resistentes *umbone nominis sui* aliquamdiu dispulit; sed tandem, vi et numero impar, cessit violentiæ." Mr. St. John (Four Conquests, ii. 106, 7) makes Godwine first assert the rights of the Æthelings, which I suppose is his interpretation of the words of William, and then himself propose the compromise in favour of Harthacnut. For this he refers us to Simeon; but Simeon (X Scriptt. 179) only copies the narrative of Florence, which, Mr. St. John had just before said, "confuses the whole subject."

¹ See above, p. 436.

² I see that the same idea has occurred to Mr. St. John (ii. 110). It was suggested to me by the words of the Peterborough Chronicle (evidently misunderstood by the Canterbury Chronicler); "And he [Harold] was

told of any stipulations as to the succession. It would follow, almost as a matter of course, that, if either of the brothers died childless, the survivor would be elected to his portion of the Kingdom. According to one account, Archbishop Æthelnoth, the friend of Cnut, still refused to consecrate Harold as King. He placed the crown and sceptre on the altar; Harold might seize them, if he dared, but while a son of Emma survived, he, Æthelnoth, would crown no King but a son of Emma, and every Bishop of his province was equally forbidden to perform the rite.¹ If this tale be true, it was an assertion of independence on the part of the ecclesiastical power for which we might in vain seek a parallel in the English history of those times. The Archbishop, as a member of the Gemót, might give his vote for whichever candidate he pleased; but when the election was made, he had clearly no right to refuse to consecrate the King elected by the majority. We may also remark that the story, if it belongs to this time,² implies the Imperial supremacy of Harold. With a mere King of the Mercians and Northumbrians, whether an under-King or an altogether independent sovereign, the Archbishop of Canterbury, a West-Saxon subject, could have nothing to do.

CHAP. VI.
Rumoured
refusal of
Arch-
bishop
Æthelnoth
to crown
Harold.

The Kingdom was thus divided. The King-elect of

þæh full cyng ofer eall Englalond." This however, as I remarked in p. 534, may perhaps refer to Harold's second election in 1037. But an Imperial supremacy on the part of Harold seems quite consistent with the general tenor of events, and such a supposition may perhaps render the account of the fate of the Ætheling Ælfred one degree less obscure.

¹ Encom. Emmæ, pp. 27, 28.

² It is possible that the tale, if true, may belong to the second election of Harold in 1037, and may have been thrust back in the confused chronology of the Encomiast. Roger of Wendover (i. 473) asserts a coronation; "*Prævaluit pars Haroldi et regni Angliæ illum diademate insignivit.*" So Bromton (X Scriptt. 932); Harold was "*ab Ethelnode Dorobernensi Archiepiscopo apud Lundonias consecratus.*" The believers in the false Ingulf may also entertain themselves with a story about Harold's coronation robe, and a great deal more about which authentic history is silent. See St. John, ii. 107-10.

CHAP. VI. the West-Saxons was in no hurry—the affairs of his Northern Kingdom did not allow him to be in a hurry—to take personal possession of the fragment of a realm which was all that Godwine had been able to secure for him. Emma appears to have been invested with a kind of regency in her son's name, while Godwine retained his post as Earl, and with it the administration of the West-Saxon Kingdom. It is specially mentioned that Harthacnut's housecarls remained with Emma.¹ The housecarls of Harthacnut had doubtless been the housecarls of Cnut; their loyalty was personal to their master, and would naturally pass to his widow and her son. But that their presence was allowed in the West-Saxon Kingdom and capital under the administration of Godwine clearly shows that they had not been employed during the late reign as instruments of oppression, and that they were not looked on with any general hatred by the people at large.

It was in the course of the next year that an happened of which advantage has ever since been by hostile tongues and pens to stain the character great Earl of the West-Saxons with a charge deepest treachery. But even in the period on which are now entering, a period in which we have at every step to weigh the conflicting statements of national and political partizanship, there is no event about which the various versions of the tale are more utterly at variance with each other. The story is told with every conceivable variety of time, place, and person, and even our earliest and best authorities contain statements which it is impossible to reconcile with one another. Thus much of the earliest attain; first, that, about this time, one or both of the sons of Æthelred and Emma made an attempt to recover their father's Kingdom; secondly, that Ælfred, the younger of the two Æthelings, fell into the power of Harold.

¹ See the extract from the Peterborough Chronicle, abridged by the monk of Peterborough, 1136.

LANDING AND FATE OF ÆLFRED.

and was cruelly put to death; thirdly, that God incurred suspicion of being an accomplice. But, beyond this, there is hardly a circumstance of the story which can be asserted with any confidence. The first place after the death of Cnut and the first election of Harthacnut is placed beyond all doubt by the complete agreement of the best authorities.¹ But very respectable second authorities have completely misplaced the date,² and the

¹ Chronn. and Flor. Wig. in anno. Vita Ead. 401. So Knocm. Emmae. Et et seqq. Will. Pict. (ed. Maseres), 37 et seqq. Roman de Rou, 9761 et seqq.

² The account given by William of Malmesbury is very remarkable; but He hardly believes the story, because it is not in the Chronicle, but tells it, because it was a common report; "Quia fama sent, non quia chronica tacet, pro solido non asserui." He therefore had the borough Chronicle before him. So just before; "Sanè ne silentio Ead. Emmae quod de primogenito [Ælfred was certainly the younger] Ethelr. Elfrido rumigeruli spargunt." The tale is placed by him in 1040, at the death of Harold and before the arrival of Harthacnut. Mr. Harthacnut in his note, proposes to read "mortem Cnutonis" for "mortem Haroldi" but this is destroying evidence, not explaining it. Ælfred enters the Kingdom; by the treachery of his countrymen, chiefly of Godwin ("compatriotarum perfidia et maxime Godwini), he is blinded at Gillingham (probably a mistake for Guildford); thence he is taken to where he soon dies. His companions are beheaded, save one in ten, who are allowed to escape. Cf. above, p. 386. Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. 758 D) pushes on the story yet a reign further. It is now placed after the death of Harthacnut in 1042. On that King's death the English select for Ælfred, the elder of the Æthelings, to succeed to the Crown. Eadward comes, and brings with him a great number of his mother's kinsfolk and of other Normans. Now Godwine (quum esset Consul fortissimus et prator servissimus) has determined that the new King shall marry his daughter. But he sees that Ælfred's high spirit (quia primogenitus erat et magnæ probitatis) will not consent to this scheme, while he thinks that the milder spirit of Eadward (frater minor et simplicior) will submit to the yoke. Godwine then harangues the Witan (intimavit igitur Angliæ); Ælfred has brought with him too many Normans; he has promised them lands in England; it will not be safe to allow and so crafty a people to take root in the land; the strangers punished lest other strangers should venture to presume on their to royalty to meddle with Englishmen and English affairs (ne alii andeant pro Regis cognatione se Angliæ ingerere). Ælfred's companions are then decimated at Guildford, in the fashion mentioned; but even the tenth part seem to the English too many to

CHAP. VI. thus given occasion for a lower class of compilers to load the story with an infinity of mythical and calumnious details.¹ According to the Norman account, both the *Norman version.* Æthelings had a share in the attempt.² As soon as the death of Cnut was known in Normandy, Eadward sailed across to Southampton with forty ships and landed. But the English, whether for love or for fear³ of their Danish

Invasion of
England by
Eadward.

allowed to live (*nimum visum est Anglis tot superesse*); so they are decimated again; the Ætheling is blinded and sent to Ely, as before.

¹ Bromton (X Scriptt. 934 et seqq.) gives a variety of versions, but decides in favour of one grounded on that of Henry of Huntingdon. He adds several particulars, especially that the English nobles were so enraged against Godwine that they vowed that he should die a worse death than Eadric the betrayer of his *cyne-hlaford* (*dominum suum naturalem Regem*) Eadmund. (It is a little remarkable that this expression is used without any hint as to the supposed kindred between Godwine and Eadric.) On this Godwine flees to Denmark and remains there four years, his lands and goods being meanwhile confiscated. But Bromton's most remarkable version is one in which the death of Ælfred, combined with an attempt to poison Eadward, is attributed to the joint action of Godwine, Harthacnut, and Emma herself. The same scandal turns up again in the Winchester Annals (Angl. Sacr. i. 292. Luard, Ann. Mon. ii. 22), as part of the legend of Emma and the ploughshares. So also in Bromton himself, X Scriptt. 942. But the Winchester Annalist had just before (Luard, ii. 17) given his own version. The tale is placed in the reign of Harthacnut. Godwine wishes to open the succession to his own son Harold. He entices Ælfred over—Duke Robert, notwithstanding his death and burial in the East, keeps Eadward back in Normandy—and causes one tenth of his companions to be beheaded, the rest to be tortured and *crucified*, and the Ætheling himself to be embowelled. Godwine's instructions to his agents are given in two very graphic speeches. I trust that so pleasant a writer as Richard of Devizes is not answerable for this stuff. See Luard, p. xi.

² We find this version in William of Poitiers, the Conqueror's chaplain, the extant portion of whose narrative begins at this point. Duchesne, 178. Maseres, 37. He is followed by William of Jumièges, vii. 8, 9, and the Roman de Rou, 9761 et seqq.

³ Will. Pict. 37. "*Heraldum Angli deserere nolebant, vel (quod est credibilis) non audebant, metuentes affore Danos ad protectionem sive citatam ultionem ejus.*" So Roman de Rou, 9783;

"Mais li Engleiz, ki bien saveient
Ke li frere venir debveient,
Nes' voudrent mie recoillir
Ne en la terre retenir.
Herout li fils Kenut dotoent,
U poet cel estre k'il l' amoent."

VERSION OF THE CHRONICLES.

King Harold—Harthacnut is not mentioned—met t
as enemies. Eadward fought a battle and defeated
English with great slaughter. But, reflecting how
was the strength of England and how small was the f
which he had brought with him, he presently sailed aw
taking with him great plunder. Nothing of all this is kno
either to the English Chroniclers or to the panegyrist
Queen Emma. Those versions of the Chronicles wh
tell the story at all speak of Ælfred only.² It must
be forgotten that the entry in these Chronicles takes
form of a ballad. According to this account, Ælfred ca
to England, whence or under what circumstances we
not told, and wished to go to his mother at Winchest
In this purpose he was hindered by men who were powe
ful at the time, and who unjustly favoured Harold. In o
version these men are nameless; in another Godwine
mentioned as their chief.³ Then the Ætheling and
companions are seized; some are killed outright, some
in bonds, some sold as slaves, others blinded or put
various tortures and horrible deaths.⁴ No worse deed ha

¹ The Peterborough Chronicle, that which William of Malmesbury ha
before him, is silent. The Abingdon and Worcester Chronicles inse
the ballad.

² Florence seems to follow the Chronicles, with touches from other
sources. But he makes both brothers come, turning "Ælfred se
speling" into "innocentes clitones Ælfredus et Eadwardus." They renc
their mother at Winchester, whence Ælfred goes to a confer
Harold in London; Godwine stops him at Guildford, and the detail
follow as usual. As soon as Emma hears of the fate of Ælfred's comrades
she sends Eadward back to Normandy.

³ Chron. Wig. in anno. "Ac þæt ne gæpafodon þa þe mical weoldon o
þisan lande; forþan hit hleoþrade þa swiþe to Harolde, þeah hit unriht
wære." Chron. Ab. "Ac hit him ne gæpafode Godwine Earl ne ðc opre mæn
þe mycel mihton wealdan: forþan hit bleoþrode þa swiþe toward Harald
þeah hit unriht wære." So Florence; "Quod indignè graviterque Harald
potentes nonnulli, quia, licet injustum esset, Haroldo multo
existere quam illis, maxime, ut fertur, Comes Godwinus." Harald
⁴ Some were scalped: "nonnullos cute capitis abstractis cruciavit."

CHAP. VI. ever been done since the Danes came into the land.¹ All this was done, according to one version, by Godwine, according to the other, by Harold.² The Ætheling still lived; so he was taken to Ely in a ship, blinded while still on board, given thus blinded to the monks, with whom he lived till he died soon after, and then was buried honourably in the minster.³

Norman version of the fate of Ælfred.

This account, it will be at once seen, has about it somewhat of that vagueness which is only natural in a poem which is rather a lamentation than a narrative. The Norman version, true or false, is at least fuller and clearer.⁴ According to this account, soon after the expedition of Eadward, Ælfred set sail from Wissant,⁵ and landed at Dover. As he went onwards into the country, Godwine met him, received him friendly, and seemingly did homage to him.⁶ The Earl and the Ætheling supped together, and talked over their plans. But in the night

¹ "Ne wearð dreorlice dæd
Gedon on þison earde,

Syððan Dene comen,
And her frið namon."

The Chronicler's way of reckoning is changed since the days of Brunanburh, when the fight was the greatest ever fought,

"Syððan eastan hider
Engle and Seaxe

Up becomen
Ofer bradbrimu," &c.

² The ballad in the Abingdon Chronicle begins,

"Ac Godwine hine ƿa gelette,
And hine on hæft sette;"

while in the Worcester version it runs,

"Da let he [Harold] hine on hæft settan."

There can be no doubt that the Abingdon version is the original, and that the Worcester text was altered by an admirer of Godwine.

³ "At the west end, near the steeple, in the south portico." This makes one think that the present arrangements of the west front of Ely reproduce something far earlier.

⁴ Will. Pict. p. 38. Maseres. Roman de Rou, 9805. Will. Gem. vii. 9.

⁵ "Portus Icius," Will. Pict. "Wincant," Wace. "Portus Wissant," Will. Gem. Since Dr. Guest's exposition of the matter, it is hardly necessary to say that "Portus Icius" or "Icius" is not Boulogne, still less Walcheren.

⁶ Will. Pict. u. s. "Officium suum benignè promisit, oscula dante ad fidem ac dextram."

NORMAN VERSION.

Godwine seized Ælfred, tied his hands behind his back and thus sent him and some of his companions to London to King Harold. Others he put in prison, others he bowelled.¹ Among those who were sent to London, Harold beheaded Ælfred's chief companions, and blinded Ætheling himself. In that state he was sent naked and with his legs tied under his horse's belly. He had not been long at Ely when he died, as the weapon with which his eyes had been cut out had wounded the brain.

The account in the Chronicles gave us no information as to the circumstances under which the Ætheling landed in the Norman version his coming is simply part of the Norman invasion. Eadward had come with a force large enough to fight a battle; Ælfred's force, we are told, was still larger.³ The Encomiast has quite another story to tell.⁴ It must be remembered that, in his version, Eadward and Ælfred are not sons of Æthelred, but younger sons of Cnut and Emma, sent over to Normandy for education.⁵ So monstrous a mis-statement, whether

¹ "Eviscerator." Bromton (X Scriptt. 935) describes the process; "Quidam namque dicunt quod, primordiis viscerum ejus umbilico aperto et tractis et ad stipitem ligatis, ipsum tantis vicibus stimulis ferre circumdlexerunt, donec novissima viscerum extrahebantur; et sic prout ditione Godwini apud Ely mortuus est Alfredus."

² "Cui dum oculi effoderentur, cultro cerebrum violavit mucro." Will. Pict. So the Ely History, edited by Stewart, p. 209, where the narrative is made up from Florence and William of Poitiers. The Ely History (Gale (ii. 32. p. 508) follows Florence only.

³ Eadward, as we have seen, had forty ships; Ælfred came "accuratius quam frater antea adversus vim præparatus." So the Roman de Rollo (9806) speaks of his "grant navie."

⁴ Enc. Emu. p. 32.
⁵ Ib. p. 22. Harthacnut is kept at home; "alios vero liberales filios educandos direxerunt [Cnuto et Emma] Normanniam." That the Æthelings are intended appears from p. 25; "Namque unus eorum Hardeknute scilicet, quem pater Regem Danorum constituit, suo more batur in regno; duo vero alii in Normannia finibus ad nutriendum traditi, cum propinquo suo degebant Roberto." He then goes on with the election of Harold, the forged letter, and the rest.

CHAP. VI. condemned the pretended Prince of Wales to indignities and torments quite as cruel as any that Harold Harefoot inflicted on the Ætheling and his companions.¹ To have put James or Charles Stewart to death in the horrible form which the Law decreed for the traitor would doubtless have called forth as vehement a storm of righteous indignation as was called forth by the death of the Ætheling Ælfred. Still the act would have been legal; it might have inflicted indelible shame on the King and his counsellors who ordered it, but it would have been no ground of blame whatever against the gaoler, the Sheriff, or the executioner. So it was with the case of Ælfred. According to one account, first Eadward and then Ælfred entered the land at the head of a foreign army; they tried, in short, to repeat the exploit of Cnut, to forestall the exploit of William. In banished men, eager for a restoration to their country on any terms, such conduct may admit of many excuses. Still, on the face of it, they put themselves in the position of open enemies of their country. If Eadward really landed at the head of a Norman army, if he really fought a battle against an English force at Southampton, those who resisted him were as plainly doing their simple duty as the men who fought at Maldon or at Senlac. Even if we reject this version, if we believe that Ælfred entered the country, not with an army but with a mere escort of strangers, still he was coming, seemingly without any invitation from any party in the country, to disturb a settlement which the Legislature of the Kingdom had established, and which he was not likely to upset except by force of arms. Men who run such desperate ventures must take the consequences. If Godwine, as a military commander, fought against Eadward; if, as a

The real
question
as to God-

¹ Cf. Baron Maseres' note on the *Encomium*, p. 31.

QUESTION AS TO GODWINE.

civil magistrate, he arrested Ælfred, he simply did his duty and nothing else. The only question would be I before put it, Was there any treachery or needless cruelty in the matter? Now cruelty is perhaps of all crimes that which most needs to be looked at with reference to the habits and feelings of the age. What one looks on as mildness another age looks on as barbarous. But it is clear that the cruelties practised by Harold towards his captives did revolt the public opinion of the ferocious time in which he lived. As for deliberate treachery, that is a crime in all ages alike. If then we set aside accusations which rest on mere misconception of case, the question remains whether the evidence is enough to convict Godwine either of personal treachery towards the Ætheling or of complicity in the savage cruelty of Harold.

Now in reading any version of the story one great difficulty at once presents itself. Godwine is always described as acting a part utterly inconsistent with his real position at the time. Not one of the versions of the tale takes any notice of the division of the Kingdom. They all talk of Harold as sole King and to look on Godwine as his minister. Even the biographer of Eadward, who had known Godwine personally, seems, in the very act of defending him, to forget his actual position. The English historian also, whose tale is not necessarily inconsistent with Godwine's innocence, seems to know nothing of any King but Harold; Godwine, if not Harold's minister, is at least Harold's subject. Yet we know that, at this time, Godwine was neither Harold's minister nor Harold's subject. Harthacnut was still the acknowledged King, at all events King-elect, of the West-Saxons; Emma was still sitting at Winchester as Regent in his name; Godwine, who had secured for them this remnant of dominion, was then their chief minister and general. If Godwine acted in the

CHAP. VI. condemned the pretended Prince of Wales to indignities and torments quite as cruel as any that Harold Harefoot inflicted on the Ætheling and his companions.¹ To have put James or Charles Stewart to death in the horrible form which the Law decreed for the traitor would doubtless have called forth as vehement a storm of righteous indignation as was called forth by the death of the Ætheling Ælfred. Still the act would have been legal; it might have inflicted indelible shame on the King and his counsellors who ordered it, but it would have been no ground of blame whatever against the gaoler, the Sheriff, or the executioner. So it was with the case of Ælfred. According to one account, first Eadward and then Ælfred entered the land at the head of a foreign army; they tried, in short, to repeat the exploit of Cnut, to forestall the exploit of William. In banished men, eager for a restoration to their country on any terms, such conduct may admit of many excuses. Still, on the face of it, they put themselves in the position of open enemies of their country. If Eadward really landed at the head of a Norman army, if he really fought a battle against an English force at Southampton, those who resisted him were as plainly doing their simple duty as the men who fought at Maldon or at Senlac. Even if we reject this version, if we believe that Ælfred entered the country, not with an army but with a mere escort of strangers, still he was coming, seemingly without any invitation from any party in the country, to disturb a settlement which the Legislature of the Kingdom had established, and which he was not likely to upset except by force of arms. Men who run such desperate ventures must take the consequences. If Godwine, as a military commander, fought against Eadward; if, as a

The real
question
as to God-

¹ Cf. Baron Maseres' note on the *Encomium*, p. 31.

lawful King driven from his throne. Harold was not a usurper, keeping the lawful heir out of his lawful possession. Godwine was not a rebel, conspiring to betray a prince to whom his allegiance was lawfully due. On any version of the story, Ælfred appeared in England as the enemy of a settled government, established by a regular vote of the Legislature. As such, it was the part and duty of the King, of the Earl, and of the people in general, to resist him. He was a pretender to the Crown entering the Kingdom at the head of a foreign force, whether great or small. There has never been any time or place in which such a pretender would not have been arrested at once; there have been few times and places in which such a pretender would not have been speedily put to death. Against the arrest of Ælfred not a word can be said; against his execution, in the eleventh century, very little can be said. The question is whether either the arrest or the execution was accompanied with any circumstances of treachery or needless cruelty. The sons of Æthelred were very much in the position of the elder and younger Pretender in the reigns of George the First and Second. In both cases the power which had a right to dispose of the Crown had disposed of it, and not in their favour. Now no man could have blamed any officer, civil or military, in the service of King George, for arresting either James or Charles Edward Stewart. In so doing he would simply have been doing his duty to his King and country. If either Pretender had been arrested, his execution would doubtless have been a very harsh measure, but it would have been a perfectly legal measure; he was attainted, and he might have been as regularly executed as Monmouth was. Nay, the letter of the Law, as the Law stood till the reign of George the Third, as it was actually enforced as late as the reign of Charles the Second, would have

CHAP. VI.
Ælfred's
position
analogous
to that
of the
Stewart
Pretenders.

CHAP. VI. condemned the pretended Prince of Wales to indignities and torments quite as cruel as any that Harold Harefoot inflicted on the Ætheling and his companions.¹ To have put James or Charles Stewart to death in the horrible form which the Law decreed for the traitor would doubtless have called forth as vehement a storm of righteous indignation as was called forth by the death of the Ætheling Ælfred. Still the act would have been legal; it might have inflicted indelible shame on the King and his counsellors who ordered it, but it would have been no ground of blame whatever against the gaoler, the Sheriff, or the executioner. So it was with the case of Ælfred. According to one account, first Eadward and then Ælfred entered the land at the head of a foreign army; they tried, in short, to repeat the exploit of Cnut, to forestall the exploit of William. In banished men, eager for a restoration to their country on any terms, such conduct may admit of many excuses. Still, on the face of it, they put themselves in the position of open enemies of their country. If Eadward really landed at the head of a Norman army, if he really fought a battle against an English force at Southampton, those who resisted him were as plainly doing their simple duty as the men who fought at Maldon or at Senlac. Even if we reject this version, if we believe that Ælfred entered the country, not with an army but with a mere escort of strangers, still he was coming, seemingly without any invitation from any party in the country, to disturb a settlement which the Legislature of the Kingdom had established, and which he was not likely to upset except by force of arms. Men who run such desperate ventures must take the consequences. If Godwine, as a military commander, fought against Eadward; if, as a

The real
question
as to God-

¹ Cf. Baron Maseres' note on the *Encomium*, p. 31.

civil magistrate, he arrested Ælfred, he simply did his duty and nothing else. The only question would be, as before put it, Was there any treachery or needless cruelty in the matter? Now cruelty is perhaps of all charges that which most needs to be looked at with reference to the habits and feelings of the age. What one age looks on as mildness another age looks on as barbarity. But it is clear that the cruelties practised by Harold towards his captives did revolt the public opinion even of the ferocious time in which he lived. As for deliberate treachery, that is a crime in all ages alike. If then we set aside accusations which rest on mere misconception of the case, the question remains whether the evidence is enough to convict Godwine either of personal treachery towards the Ætheling or of complicity in the savage cruelties of Harold.

CHAP. VI.

wine ;
Was he
guilty of
treachery
or needless
cruelty ?

Now in reading any version of the story one great difficulty at once presents itself. Godwine is always described as acting a part utterly inconsistent with his real position at the time. Not one of the versions of the tale takes any notice of the division of the Kingdom. They all seem to assume Harold as sole King and to look on Godwine as his minister. Even the biographer of Eadward, who had known Godwine personally, seems, in the very act of defending him, to forget his actual position. The Encomiast also, whose tale is not necessarily inconsistent with Godwine's innocence, seems to know nothing of any King but Harold ; Godwine, if not Harold's minister, is at least Harold's subject. Yet we know that, at this time, Godwine was neither Harold's minister nor Harold's subject. Harthacnut was still the acknowledged King, at all events King-elect, of the West-Saxons ; Emma was still sitting at Winchester as Regent in his name ; Godwine, who had secured for them this remnant of dominion, was their chief minister and general. If Godwine acted in any

Incon-
sistency
of the
ordinary
story with
the fact
of the
division
of the
Kingdom.

CHAP. VI. way in the interest of Harold, it could only have been because Harold was, as I suggested above, the superior lord of his own sovereign; because the invasion, or attempt of whatever kind, made by the Æthelings infringed not only the rights of the King of the West-Saxons, but also the rights of the Emperor of Britain. This is certainly possible, but it is rather straining a point; nothing of the sort is at all implied in the language of any of the writers who tell the tale. They all, even the best informed, seem to know nothing of the kingship of Harthacnut and the regency of Emma. This apparent ignorance of writers, some of them contemporary, on such a point shows in the most remarkable way how soon and how completely the first ephemeral reign of Harthacnut was forgotten. But their forgetfulness certainly goes a good way to diminish the trustworthiness of their own tale. When their main story involves so great a misconception, can we trust any of their details? The inconsistency is manifest; it seems to have been felt at the time. The ballad which laments the fate of the Ætheling is found only in those Chronicles which do not directly mention the division of the Kingdom. And, even of these, one inserts the ballad in a form which does not accuse Godwine. The Peterborough Chronicle, which is so explicit as to the division of the Kingdom, says nothing about the fate of the Ætheling. The Norman writers, so eloquent about the fate of the Ætheling, know nothing of the kingship of Harthacnut. Florence, who attempts to combine the two stories, falls into all sorts of confusions and inconsistencies. In fact the stories as they stand are irreconcilable. Godwine cannot have played the part attributed to him by his enemies while the arrangement decreed by the Witenagemót of Oxford was still in force. But the historical character of that arrangement is undoubted. That the Kingdom really was divided, that Godwine

really was at this time the minister, not of Harold but of Harthacnut, are facts which cannot be gainsayed. They are asserted by two of the Chronicles and they are implied by the other two. The details of the story of Ælfred are thus upset. They cannot have happened in the manner and at the time at which they are said to have happened. It was perhaps a feeling of this inconsistency which led later writers, from William of Malmesbury onwards, to shift the story to a later time, to the time immediately following the death, not of Cnut, but of either Harold or Harthacnut. But the part played by Harold is the most essential part of the story; the tale cannot be fitted in to a later time except by a complete change of its circumstances. Altogether I think it must be allowed that the direct evidence brought to implicate Godwine in any guilty share in the business altogether breaks down.

CHAP. VI.

The direct evidence against Godwine fails.

On the other hand, we have to explain the fact that Godwine was suspected, that the suspicion arose early and prevailed extensively, and was not confined to Godwine's foreign enemies and slanderers. Godwine was indeed not the only person who was suspected. We have seen that one tale or legend accused Emma herself;¹ another laid the guilt to the charge of Lyfing, Bishop of Crediton, a Prelate who often appears as a powerful supporter of Godwine's policy;² in another version, if Godwine was the instigator, the English people in general seem to have been his accomplices.³ Still Godwine was specially suspected, and suspected while the memory of the event was still fresh. The story was not, as the biographer of Eadward seems to imply, a mere inven-

Early suspicions against Godwine.

¹ See above, p. 544.

² Will. Malm. ii. 188. "Livingus Cridietunensis episcopus, quem fama facti auctorem asserebat."

³ See above, p. 543, for Henry of Huntingdon's version.

CHAP. VI. tion of the Norman Archbishop Robert. Godwine was formally accused and formally acquitted of the crime [1040.] soon after the accession of Harthacnut, four years after the event. He was acquitted, as we shall presently see,¹ by the solemn judgement of the highest Court in the realm, and he is fully entitled to the benefit of that acquittal. Still the mere fact of his accusation has to be explained. The charge, brought at such a time and in such a form, could not have been a mere Norman slander. Godwine's accuser, in fact, was an Englishman of the highest rank. Nor would a mere Norman slander ever have been embodied in popular songs, or have found a place in any version of the English Chronicles. Such a suspicion—strong, early, native—proves something. Godwine, guilty or innocent, must have done some act which, to say the least, was capable of an unfortunate misconstruction. By putting together one or two hints in the different accounts, we may perhaps arrive at a probable conjecture as to what his share in the matter really was. The Encomiast is a perplexing writer to deal with; one knows not what to make of an historian who was either so easily imposed upon or else so utterly reckless as to truth. A contemporary writer who wipes out Emma's marriage with Æthelred, who looks on the Æthelings as sons of Cnut, who is ignorant that his heroine was actually Queen-Regent over Wessex, is really somewhat of a curiosity. Yet ever and anon, if we use his narrative with caution, we may learn something from it. And here it is remarkable that, though this writer utterly misconceives the state of the Kingdom, his tale is the only one which, while consistent with Godwine's innocence, explains the early and prevalent suspicion as to his guilt. Let us look at the circum-

Some ground for the suspicion must be supposed.

Testimony of the Encomiast.

¹ See below, p. 573.

stances. It appears that the feeling which broke out CHAP. VI.
 openly in the next year was already beginning to show Probable
state of
the case.
 itself; men, even in Wessex, were beginning to be weary
 of the absent Harthacnut. Well they might; to wait so
 long for an absent King, who, still uncrowned, unsworn,
 unanointed, could not be looked on as fully King, was
 something altogether unparalleled. It was not wonderful
 if popular feeling was, as the Chronicles which notice the
 story tell us, veering round, however wrongfully, in
 favour of Harold.¹ At such a moment, a son of Æthel-
 red, either knowing the state of the Kingdom, or eager
 to try his chance in any case, lands in England. We of
 course dismiss the story which speaks of actual invasion
 and warfare; that is probably a mere repetition of the at-
 tempted invasion by Duke Robert. But the Ætheling was Godwine
probably
met Ælf-
red.
 in England; if Godwine was really anxious to preserve the
 settlement which gave Wessex to a son of Emma, it
 might well occur to him to inquire whether the game
 could not be better played with the present son of
 Æthelred than with the absent son of Cnut. He may
 have sought an interview with the Ætheling; he may
 possibly even have pledged himself to his cause. But
 if a son of Æthelred was at large in England, the throne
 of Harold would be endangered as well as the throne
 of Harthacnut. Harold and his emissaries would be on
 the alert. The prince who had, perhaps before his elec-
 tion, seized on Emma's treasures at Winchester, would
 not, in such a case, be very scrupulous about respecting
 the frontiers of his brother's Kingdom. Perhaps, if he
 were superior Lord, he might have a real right to interfere
 in a matter which clearly touched the interests of the whole
 Empire. At any rate, if the Ætheling and his companions
 were known to be lodged in a West-Saxon town not very

¹ "Forðan hit hleoðrode þa swiðe toward Haraldes, þe h hit unriht wære."

THE DANISH KINGS IN ENGLAND.

on the borders of the Northern Kingdom, it is per-
conceivable that they might be seized by the agents
old, against the will or without the knowledge of
ne. Such a supposition seems to be quite con-
with the details of the actual seizure given by the
iast, details about which he was more likely to be
nformed than about the secret machinations of
. When the Ætheling was once seized and carried
dwine might well think that the game was up, that
ar of Harold was fairly in the ascendant, and that
interest nor duty called on him to plunge Wessex
war with Northumberland and Mercia either to
Ælfred or to revenge his wrongs. Such conduct
not be that of a sentimental and impulsive hero;
ld be that of a wary and hard-headed statesman.
conduct would involve no real treachery, but it
easily give occasion to the suspicion of treachery. If
ne received the Ætheling, and Harold's agents after-
seized him, it would be an easy inference that God-
betrayed him to Harold. As soon as the tale had once
loat, mythical details would, as ever, gather round
When Godwine was once believed to have betrayed
d, it would be an obvious improvement on the story
ke him a personal agent in the barbarities to which
pposed treason had given occasion. On the whole,
it is clear that the language of the Encomiast seems
t be received, the probable kernel of truth on which
nt out to us the language of the Encomiast seems
bulous details gradually fastened themselves.
the whole then I incline to the belief that the great
every other recorded action of whose life is that of
nglish patriot, who on every other occasion appears
nciliatory and law-abiding, who is always as hostile
everything like wrong or violence as the rude age in
he lived would let him be, did not, on this one

occasion, act in a manner so contrary to his whole cha- CHAP. VI.
 racter as to resort to fraud or needless violence to compass
 the destruction of a man of English birth and royal de-
 scent. The innocence of Godwine seems to me to be most
 probable in itself, most consistent with the circumstances
 of the time, and not inconsistent with such parts of our
 evidence as seem most trustworthy. But in any case, even
 if, while rejecting palpable fables and contradictions, we
 take the evidence, so far as it is credible, at the worst,
 even then it seems to me that the great Earl is at least
 entitled to a verdict of Not Proven, if not of Not Guilty.¹

The next year after the unfortunate attempt of Ælfred² was marked by the termination of the short-lived arrange- Disap-
pointment
of the hopes
of the West-
Saxons.
 ment which had been made between the two sons of Cnut.
 The West-Saxons had apparently supported Harthacnut

¹ Two charters ascribed to Eadward the Confessor, but of very doubtful genuineness, speak of the murder of Ælfred in a way which ought to be noticed. In the first (Cod. Dipl. iv. 173), Eadward is made to attribute the death of his brother to Harold and Harthacnut conjointly, and to speak of himself as being with difficulty rescued from them; "Invadentibus regnum Swegeni et Cnuto filio Regis, Regibus Danorum, ac filiis ipsius Chnuti Haroldo et Hardechnuto, à quibus etiam alter meus frater Ælfredus crudeliter occisus est, solusque, sicut Joas occisionem Oholiæ, sic ego illorum crudelitatem evasi." In the other (Cod. Dipl. iv. 181) the crime is attributed to the Danes generally; "Dani qui fratrem meum alium Ælfredum miserabiliter interemptum enecaverunt." Now, even if these charters be spurious, they still have a certain value as witnessing to popular belief on the subject. Neither of them mentions Godwine—had they done so, Godwine's sons could hardly have been represented as signing them. But the mention of the fact in charters signed by them might imply that the subject was not one which they at all sought to avoid. The second charter is perfectly vague; but the language of the former, attributing the deed to Harold and Harthacnut, is remarkable. That Harthacnut personally had no hand in it needs no proof; neither was Eadward ever in the least danger at the hands of Harthacnut, who acted towards him as an attached brother. Is the charge against Harthacnut meant to convey an indirect charge against the representative of Harthacnut, that is, against Emma herself?

² The year of Ælfred's death was the year of the marriage of his half-sister Gunhild. See above, p. 505.

CHAP. VI. as the representative of that policy of his father which had raised Wessex, not only to the headship of England and of all Britain, but to the practical headship of all Northern Europe. No hope on the part of any nation was ever more grievously disappointed. No contrast could be greater than the contrast between Wessex in the days of Cnut and Wessex in these two years of Harthacnut. Wessex was no longer the chosen dominion, Winchester was no longer the chosen capital, of an Emperor of the North, whose name was dreaded on the Baltic and revered on the Tiber. The old Imperial Kingdom had sunk to be, what she had never been before, a dependent province ruled by representatives of an absent sovereign. A King of the Danes, who did not think England worthy of his presence, held the West-Saxon Kingdom, seemingly as a vassal of the King of the Mercians and Northumbrians, and entrusted it to the government of his Norman mother. It would doubtless be no excuse in English eyes that Denmark was now threatened by Magnus of Norway,¹ and that Harthacnut's first duty was to provide for its defence. To the West-Saxon people it would simply seem that they had chosen a King whom no entreaties on the part of his English subjects could persuade to come and take personal possession of his English Kingdom. Being absent, he must have remained uncrowned, and his lack of the consecrating rite would alone, in the ideas of those times, be enough to make his government altogether uncertain and provisional. Even the influence of Godwine could not prolong—most likely it was not exerted to prolong—a state of things so essentially offensive to all patriotic feeling. It was felt that to accept the rule of Harold would be a far less evil than to retain a nominal independence which was practically a degrading bondage. Popular feeling therefore set strongly in favour of union

Degrading
position of
Wessex.

¹ See Snorre, Saga viii. c. 6, 7 (Laing, ii. 364). Adam Brem. ii. 74.

with Mercia and Northumberland, even under the doubtful son of Ælfifu of Northampton. "Man chose Harold over all to King, and forsook Harthacnut, because he was too long in Denmark."¹ That is, I conceive, the Witan of Wessex, in discharge of their undoubted constitutional right,² deposed their King Harthacnut, and elected the King of the Mercians and Northumbrians as their immediate sovereign, the election being apparently confirmed by a vote of the Witan of all England. Harold was thus called by the universal voice of the nation to be King over the whole realm. The southern Kingdom, just as at the final election of his father,³ was reunited to the northern. England again became one Kingdom under one King, an union which since that day has never been broken.⁴

The reign of the new King of the English was short and troubled. His first act was the banishment of Queen Emma, who was sent out of the land at the beginning of winter.⁵ She did not return to Normandy, as that country

CHAP. VI.
Harthacnut deposed in Wessex, and Harold chosen King over all England.
1037.

Banishment of Emma.
1037.

¹ So the Abingdon and Worcester Chronicles, those which do not distinctly mention the division; "Her man geceas Harold ofer eall to kyninge; and forsoc Harðacnut, forþam he wæs to lange on Denmarcon." So Florence; "Haroldus Rex Merciorum et Northymbroꝝ, ut per totam regnaret Angliam, a principibus et omni populo, Rex eligitur. Hardecanutus vero, quia in Denemarcia moras innexuit, et ad Angliam, ut rogabatur, venire distulit, penitus abjicitur."

² See above, p. 113.

³ See above, p. 445.

⁴ The momentary reign of the younger Eadgar at York in 1068 can hardly be called a real exception.

⁵ All the Chronicles mention the banishment or "driving out" of Ælfifu-Emma. The expression is the same as that which is used in the years 963 and 964 for the expulsion of secular priests from several churches, and in 1045 for the banishment of Gunhild. One would like to know in what this driving out differed from regular outlawry. Possibly the driving out involved an actual personal removal, while the banishment involved in a sentence of outlawry was only constructive, like the Roman *aqua et ignis interdictio*. Godwine, on his outlawry, was allowed five days to leave the country (Peterborough Chronicle, 1051). The tone of the Worcester

CHAP. VI. was now in all the confusion attendant on the minority of its new sovereign, the future Conqueror. She betook herself to the court of Baldwin of Flanders, which we shall henceforth find serving as the general place of refuge for English exiles. She was received with all honour by Baldwin and his Countess Adela, the daughter of King Robert and widow of Duke Richard the Third.¹ Two of the daughters of Baldwin and Adela will play a prominent part in our future history; one of them indeed, Matilda, the wife of the great William, was destined to fill the place from which Emma herself had been driven.

Character
of Harold.

Of the administration of Harold himself we hear hardly anything. I have already mentioned the question as to his coronation. The version which affirms that he reigned without the usual consecrating rite charges him with entire neglect of Christian worship, and of choosing the hour of mass for his hunting or other amusements.² Other accounts however imply that he was not wanting in the conventional piety of the age.³ He at least, like other Kings, retained

and Abingdon Chronicles certainly seems to imply that the measure was a harsher one than that of ordinary outlawry. "And man draf ut his [Harðacnutes] modor Ælfgýfe þa cwene [she is generally called *Harðdige*], butan ælcere mildheortnesse, ongean þone wallendan winter." Florence translates, describing her as "*Alfgiva, quondam Anglorum Regina.*" Does this imply any formal deposition from royal rank?

¹ Enc. Emm. 32. Will. Malm. ii. 188.

² The Encomiast (p. 28), after mentioning Æthelnoth's refusal to crown Harold, continues; "Tandem desperatus abcessit, et episcopalem benedictionem adeò spreuit, ut non solum ipsam odiret benedictionem, verum etiam universam fugeret Christianitatis religionem. Namque, dum alii ecclesiam Christiano more missam audire subintrarent, ipse aut saltus canibus ad venandum cinxit, aut quibuscumque aliis vilissimis rebus occupavit, ut tantum declinare posset quod odivit."

³ Besides the statements of the false Ingulf (see above, p. 541), there is a very remarkable document of this reign, in which Harold appears, if not as a benefactor, at least not as an enemy, of churchmen. See Ellis, Introduction to Domesday, ii. 142. Cod. Dipl. iv. 56. Thorpe, Dipl. 338. Certain revenues at Sandwich belonging to Christ Church at Canterbury had

chaplains in his personal service, so that he can hardly have been the avowed heathen or infidel which he appears in the hostile picture. Ecclesiastical affairs however do not seem to have been in a flourishing state under his government. We read of Bishopricks being held in plurality and being sold for money. Good Archbishop Æthelnoth died in the second year of Harold's sole reign, and was succeeded by Eadsige, who appears at once in the threefold character of a royal chaplain, a monk, and a suffragan Bishop in Kent.¹ We also find another royal chaplain, Stigand, the priest of Assandun, appointed to a Bishopric, deposed, seemingly before consecration, because another competitor was ready with a larger sum, and finally reinstated, whether by dint of the same prevailing arguments we are not told.² Lyfing, Bishop of Crediton, also received the see of Worcester, seemingly in plurality.³ These appointments are worthy of notice, as throwing some light on the otherwise utterly obscure politics of this reign. Stigand, the old chaplain of Cnut, was the firm friend and counsellor of his widow.⁴ Lyfing was the right hand man of Earl Godwine. That these

CHAP. VI.
Ecclesiastical appointments.
Death of Archbishop Æthelnoth. 1038.
Eadsige succeeds.
Promotion of Stigand and Lyfing.
Reconciliation between Harold and the

been seized by the King's officers, and partly alienated to the rival monastery of Saint Augustine's. It appears however that this was done without the order or knowledge of Harold, who was then sick at Oxford, and who, on learning the fact, ordered restitution. Mr. Kemble dates the document in 1038, but it is clear that it must, as Sir Henry Ellis says, belong to 1039, or perhaps to the beginning of 1040.

¹ See Hook, *Archbishops*, i. 487. Stubbs, *Reg. Sac. Angl.* p. 19. He appears as at once royal chaplain and monk in a charter of Cnut in *Cod. Dipl.* vi. 190, and he is addressed as Bishop in two charters of the same King addressed to the Thengs of Kent. *Cod. Dipl.* vi. 187, 189. Dean Hook and Professor Stubbs place his suffragan see at the ancient church of Saint Martin near Canterbury.

² See Florence, 1038. Hook, i. 505 (where the appointment is attributed to Harthacnut). But none of the Chronicles mention the story.

³ See Florence, 1038, compared with 1046.

⁴ "Forðam he was nehst his [Eadwardes] modor ræde," says the Abingdon Chronicle of Stigand under the year 1043.

CHAP. VI. men shared in the promotions of which Harold had an
party of unusual number to distribute, that Lyfing especially be-
Godwine. came the King's personal friend,¹ seems to show that a per-
fect reconciliation was now brought about between Harold
and the party which had opposed his original election.
We may infer that Emma was sacrificed to the King's
personal dislike, a dislike which, it seems to be implied,
was shared by the mass of the people.² But there seems
to have been no disposition on Harold's part to bear
hard in any other way on his former antagonists. A
certain amount either of generosity or of policy must have
found a place in his character.

Welsh in-
road, and
death of
Eadwine.
1039.
Duncan's
siege of
Durham
and his
defeat.
1040.

It is probably a sign of degeneracy and weakness on
the part of Harold's government that the vassal King-
doms no longer remained in the same state of submission
to which they had been brought during at least the later
days of Cnut. A Welsh inroad of some importance is
recorded, in which several eminent Englishmen were
killed, and among them Eadwine, a brother of Earl Leof-
ric.³ In the next year, the last year of the reign of
Harold,⁴ Duncan, King of Scots, on what occasion we
are not told, repeated the exploit of his grandfather, and
with much the same success.⁵ He crossed the frontier
and besieged Durham. The seat of the Bernician Bishop-
rick had now grown into an important city. The eye
of Ealdhun had marked the capabilities of the site, but

¹ He was in attendance on Harold in his last sickness, whether as a poli-
tical or as a spiritual adviser. Cod. Dipl. iv. 56.

² The Chroniclers, even while condemning the driving out of Emma,
speak of it in the same breath with the election of Harold, as if they
were both alike popular acts; "Man geceas Harold . . . and forsoc Harða-
cnut . . . and man draf út his modor."

³ Chron. Ab. and Fl. Wig. in anno. Thurkill—there were many of the
name—Ælfgæt, and "many other good men" were also killed.

⁴ Sim. Dun. Hist. Dun. iii. 9 (X Scriptt. 33). "Defuncto Cnut, quum
filius ejus Haroldus jam quintum annum in regno . . . gereret."

⁵ See above, p. 357.

he had found the spot a wilderness.¹ We have already seen that, within a few years after its foundation, the town was already of importance enough to be a main object of Scottish attack. But now its strength and prosperity, though thrown back probably by the defeat of Carham, had vastly increased. Ealdhun's successor Eadmund, called to the see, as the story went, by a miraculous voice,² had completed the work of his predecessor. The minster of Durham had been brought to perfection,³ and the city of Durham had acquired strength and population enough to resist an attack by its own efforts. In the invasion of Malcolm the infant settlement had been delivered by the intervention of Earl Uhtred;

CHAP. VI.
[1006.]
Bishop
Eadmund
of Dur-
ham.
1020-1042.

¹ Sim. Dun. Hist. Dun. iii. 2. "Comitans sanctissimi patris Cuthberti corpus universus populus in Dunelnum, locum quidem naturâ munitum, sed non facilè habitabilem invenit, quoniam densissima undique silva totum occupaverat." Compare the description of Durham given by William of Malmesbury, De Gest. Pont. iii. Scriptt. p. Bed. 158 a; "Dunelmum est collis, ab unâ vallis planitie paullatim et molli clivo turgescens in tumulum; et licet situ edito et prærupto rupium omnem aditum excludat hostium, tamen ibi moderni collibus imposuerunt castellum." He then goes on to speak of the river and its fish. In p. 320 I inadvertently compared the translation of the see to Durham with such later translations as that from Dorchester to Lincoln. Practically it was one of the same class, as Durham, almost at once, utterly outstripped Chester-le-Street. But, as Ealdhun seems to have founded the town as well as the Bishoprick, the more exact parallel, in everything except the nature of the site, would be the translation of the Wiltshire Bishoprick from Old to New Sarum.

² The story is told by Simeon of Durham, Hist. Dun. iii. 6, and more briefly by Florence, 1020. The monks of Durham are met to choose a Bishop after the three years' widowhood of the see which followed the death of Ealdhun (see above, p. 496); Eadmund asks in joke why they do not choose him; they forthwith choose him in earnest, but agree to consult Saint Cuthberht; a voice issuing from his tomb thrice names Eadmund as Bishop. Eadmund now objects, on the ground of his not being a monk like his predecessors; but the election is approved by King Cnut, Eadmund makes his profession as a monk, and he is consecrated by Archbishop Wulfstan. This story seems to imply greater freedom of election in capitular bodies than seems to have been usual at the time. Bishopricks are in other cases filled directly by the King, with or without the assent of his Witan. See above, p. 320.

³ Sim. Hist. Dun. iii. 5.

CHAP. VI. the invasion of Duncan was repelled by the valour of the citizens themselves. The Scots were put to flight; of the chief men of the army the greater part were killed in the battle; the remainder owed their escape to their horses. The soldiers of meaner degree, who had suffered less in the actual combat, were slaughtered without mercy in the pursuit.¹ Northumbrian barbarism showed itself now as on the former occasion. The bloody trophies of victory were collected in the market-place of Durham, and a garland of Scottish heads again adorned the battlements of the rescued city.²

Harthacnut prepares to assert his claims. 1039.

The reign and life of Harold were now drawing to an end. Harthacnut was not at all disposed to acquiesce in the arrangements which had wholly shut him out from England. His Northern possessions were now secure. A treaty had been concluded with Magnus, according to which, as in some other instances of which we have heard, each King, in case of the other dying childless, was to succeed to his Kingdom.³ Harthacnut therefore was now able to turn his thoughts in the direction of England, and a message from his mother in Flanders is said to have further worked upon

¹ So I understand the words of Simeon, Hist. Dun. iii. 9. "*Magnâ parte equitum suorum ab his qui obsidebantur interfectâ, confusus aufugit, fugiens pedites interfectos amisit.*" The mention of "*equites*" need not imply that the Scottish army contained cavalry strictly so called, that is, men who used their horses in actual battle. It is enough to justify the expression if, among the Scots, as among the English, the chief men rode to the field (see above, p. 298); the chief men, as usual, would suffer most severely in the actual combat, while those of them who survived would have the advantage in flight.

² Sim. Hist. Dun. iii. 9. "*Quorum capita in forum collata in stipitibus sunt suspensa.*" See above, p. 358. The episcopal city of Durham on these occasions suggests the episcopal city of Czetinje, and very possibly Eadmund may have played the part of a Montenegrin Vladika.

³ Snorre, Saga viii. 7 (Laing, ii. 364). Chron. Rosk. ap. Lang. i. 377. Cf. above, pp. 436, 7.

his mind.¹ He began to make great preparations for an invasion of England,² but for the present he merely sailed to Flanders with ten ships,³ and there spent the winter with his mother. The time however was not passed in idleness. His preparations were busily carried on, and in the course of the next year he found himself at the head of a considerable fleet.⁴ No invasion however was needed, as an event which was probably not unexpected⁵ opened the way for his accession without difficulty or bloodshed. King Harold, who had been for some time lying ill at Oxford, died in that town in the month of March.⁶ He was buried at Westminster, a spot which is now mentioned in our Chronicles for the first time.⁷ Its mention however seems to show that the smaller monastery which preceded the great foundation of Eadward enjoyed a greater amount of reputation than we might otherwise have been led to think. Harold, who could not have been above two or three and twenty years old, left no recorded posterity. We hear nothing of wives, mistresses, or children of any kind.

Death of
Harold.
March 17,
1040.

¹ Enc. Emm. p. 33.

² Ib.

³ Chron. Ab. 1039. "And her com éc Harðacnut to Bricge, þar his modor wæs." Enc. Emm. u. s., where we have a story about a tempest and a vision.

⁴ Adam. Brem. ii. 72. "Contra quem frater à Daniâ veniens in Flandriâ classem adunavit. Sed Rex Anglorum, morte præventus, bellum diremit."

⁵ In the charter mentioned above (p. 562) we find some details of Harold's sickness; "And wæs se king þa binnan Oxnaforde swyðe ge-seocled, swa þæt he læg orwene his lifes." When he hears of the wrong done to Christ Church, "Ða læg se king and sweartode eall mid þare sage."

⁶ That Harold died at Oxford is plain from the above passage, and from the Peterborough Chronicle. Florence says "obiit Lundoniæ." He probably had the Worcester Chronicle before him, and inferred the place of his death from the place of his burial. William of Malmesbury agrees with the Chronicler.

⁷ Chronn. Petrib. and Cant. Fl. Wig. in anno. Will. Malm. ii. 188.

CHAP. VI.

§ 3. *The Reign of Harthacnut.* 1040—2.

Hartha-
cnut unani-
mously
chosen
King.
Easter ?
1040.

Immediately on the burial of Harold, probably at the Easter festival, the Witan of all England, English and Danish, unanimously chose Harthacnut to the Kingdom.¹ The only undoubted, and now the only surviving, son of Cnut united all claims. No attempt seems to have been made on behalf of Eadward the surviving son of Æthelred, and the events of the last reign were not likely to have prejudiced men in his favour. The universal belief of the moment was that the choice of Harthacnut was the right and wise course.² An embassy, of which Ælfweard, Bishop of London and Abbot of Evesham, was a leading member,³

¹ Will. Malms. ii. 188. "Anglis et Danis in unam sententiam convenientibus." So Hen. Hunt. M. H. B. 758 C, speaking of his landing at Sandwich; "Hardecnut . . . susceptus est [underfangen] et electus in Regem simul ab Anglis et Dacis." This comes, with improvements, from the Peterborough Chronicle; "On þis ilcan geare com Hardacnut cyng to Sandwic. . . . and he was sona underfangen ge fram Anglum ge fram Denum." Taken alone, this might imply that Harthacnut came over, like Ælfred, to seek his fortune, only with a luckier result; but the other Chronicles distinctly assert the previous embassy and therefore imply the previous election.

² Chronn. Ab. et Wig. "And man sende æfter Harðacnute to Brygoe; wende þæt man wel dyde." So Florence, "bene se facere putantes."

³ See Hist. Rams. c. 94, 95, for the embassy and for an accompanying miracle. Ælfweard was a somewhat remarkable person. He was first a monk of Ramsey, and then Abbot of Evesham, which office he held in plurality with his Bishoprick. The church of Evesham had fluctuated more than once between monks and secular canons, the canons being last introduced by Ælfhere of Mercia in the disputes which followed the death of Eadgar. See above, p. 286. Many of the estates fell into the hands of laymen, especially into those of Godwine of Lindesey, who died at Assandun. They were recovered from Godwine by a legal process, seemingly before the Witan of Mercia (coram multis principibus hujus patriæ), by the Abbot Brihtmar. But Godwine seized them again during the absence of Æthelred in Normandy in 1013. One almost fancies that this must have been by a grant from Swend, to whom Lindesey was one of the first parts of England to submit. See above, p. 394. Æthelred on his return in 1014 appointed Ælfweard Abbot, who again expelled Godwine, seemingly by force (fretus auxilio Dei atque Regis . . . cum magnâ fortitudine hinc expulit).

was sent to Bruges, to invite the newly-chosen King to take possession of his crown. He and his mother accordingly set sail for England in the course of June, he landed at Sandwich, and was presently crowned King by Archbishop Eadsige.¹

CHAP. VI.
Hartha-
cnut lands.
June 17.

The expectations which had been formed of Harthacnut were grievously disappointed. One worthless youth had simply made way for another equally worthless. Writers in the Norman interest, and members of foundations to which he was lavish, try to invest him with various virtues.² But the utmost that can be claimed for him is an easy species of munificence which showed itself in the one hand in bounty to monasteries and to the poor,³ and on the other in providing four meals daily for his courtiers.⁴ But all his recorded public acts set him before us as a rapacious, brutal, and bloodthirsty tyrant. His short reign is merely

His cha-
racter.

The local chronicler looks on Godwine's death at Assandun as the punishment of this sacrilege; "Godwinus vero qui eas injustè habuit, eodem anno (?) Dei nutu in bello contra Regem Danorum, Cnutonem Sweinonis filium, facto occisus est." These stories of occupations of monastic lands by powerful men, or in their names, meet us at every turn. See above, p. 287. Ælfweard received the Bishoprick of London from Cnut, who is called his kinsman, about 1035. We shall hear of him again. See Chron. Abb. Evesham. pp. 78-83.

¹ Rog. Wend. i. 477. So Fl. Wig. "Regnique solio mox sublimatur."

² Will. Pict. ap. Maseres, 39. "Hardechunutus . . . generi materno similior, non quæ pater aut frater crudelitate regnabat neque interitum Edwardi sed provectum volebat. Ob morbos etiam quos frequenter patiebatur, plus Deum in oculis habebat, et vitæ humanæ brevitatem."

³ See his charters for a grant to Saint Eadmund's (Cod. Dipl. iv. 60), to Abingdon (iv. 65), to Ramsey (vi. 192. Hist. Rams. c. 97 et seqq.), to Bishop Ælfwine of Winchester and his successors (iv. 68). The Ramsey charter runs in the joint names of Harthacnut and his mother.

⁴ Hen. Hunt. M. H. B. 758 D. "Claræ indolis et benignæ juventutis fuerat suis. Tantæ namque largitatis fertur fuisse ut prandia regalia quatuor in die vicibus omni curiæ suæ faceret apponi, malens à vocatis posita fercula dimitti quam à non vocatis apponenda fercula reposci." Henry then goes on to lament the niggardly practice of the Kings of his own time who provided only one meal daily. The Ramsey historian (c. 102) calls him "vir prædicandæ indolis et eximiæ in miseros pietatis." King John also was a great almsman.

CHAP. VI. a repetition of the first and worst days of his father, which he could not, like his father, invoke even the tyrant's plea of necessity in palliation of his evil deeds. Harthacnut had been unanimously chosen King; he had been received with universal joy; there was no sedition within the country, and no foreign enemy threatened it. But his conduct was that of a conqueror in a hostile land. His first act was to extort a heavy contribution from his new subjects for an object which in no way concerned them. We now learn incidentally that the standing navy of England, both under Cnut and under Harold, had consisted of sixty ships, and eight marks were paid, seemingly yearly, either to each rower singly or to some group of rowers.¹ Harthacnut had come over with sixty ships, manned by Danish soldiers, and his first act was to demand eight marks for each man of their crews, a piece of extortion which at once destroyed his newly acquired popularity. He then began to revenge himself on his enemies alive and dead. His first act in this way was an act of senseless brutality towards the dead body of his half-brother, the late King. The dead Harold, the Chronicles tell us, was dragged up and shot into a fen.³ Other writers tell the story with more detail.⁴ Some of the officers of his house-

Harthacnut's first Danegeld.

Harold's body disinterred,

¹ Chron. Petrib. 1040. "On his [Haroldes] dagum man geald xvi scipas æt ælcere hamulan [*hamelan* in Chron. Ab.] viii marcan." On the word *hamulan* Mr. Earle (p. 343) remarks, "This being a dative feminine, the nom. must be *hamule*, *hamele*; at first perhaps signifying a *rowlock-strap*, and so symbolizing some subdivision of the crew. There is not money enough to give eight marcs to every rower." The "*hamule*" then would be analogous to the "*lance*" in mediæval armies. But Florence clearly took it to mean a single rower; "*Octo marcas unicuique sue classis remigi.*"

² Chronn. Ab. et Wig. "And him wæs þa unhold eall þæt his ær gyrnde; and he ne gefræmde eac naht cynelices þa hwile þe he rixode." Florence divides this description, putting the latter clause now, and the former after what I take to be the *second* Danegeld.

³ Chronn. Ab. et Wig.

⁴ Florence in anno. Will. Malms. ii. 188. Rog. Wend. i. 477. Brompt. 933.

hold, Stir his Mayor of the Palace,¹ Eadric his dispenser, CHAP. VI.
 Thronð his executioner, all, we are told, men of great
 dignity², were sent to Westminster to dig up the body,
 and in their company we are surprised to find Earl God-
 wine and Ælfric Archbishop of York. Westminster was
 neither in Godwine's Earldom nor in Ælfric's Diocese, so
 that both these chiefs of Church and State seem out of
 place on such an occasion.³ We are however told that
 Ælfric was something more than an instrument in the
 matter; it was specially at his advice⁴ that Harthacnut was
 guilty of this cowardly piece of spite, one however which,
 like the brutalities of Harold himself towards the comrades
 of Ælfred, did not go without imitators in more polished
 times. The body of Harold was treated on the restoration
 of Harthacnut much as the body of Oliver Cromwell was
 treated on the restoration of Charles the Second. The
 late King was dug up, beheaded,⁵ and thrown, according
 to this account, into the Thames.⁶ It was afterwards

¹ "Stir majorem domûs," says Florence.

² "Alios magnæ dignitatis viros," according to Florence. William mentions Ælfric only, and adds, "et alios quos nominare piget." Roger of Wendover calls them "milites et carnifices." On the relation of the great Earls to the officers of the King's household, see above, p. 94.

³ It is possible that the presence of a Prelate was needed to sanctify the insult to consecrated ground; still Ælfweard would have been the more natural performer in his own Diocese.

⁴ So at least says William of Malmesbury in his Lives of the Archbishops of York (De Gest. Pont. lib. iii. Scriptt. p. Bedam, 154 B); "Habetur in hoc detestabilis, quod Hardacnutus ejus [Ælfrici] consilio fratris sui Haroldi cadavere defosso caput truncari, et infami mortalibus exemplo in Tamensem projici jussit."

⁵ The beheading is also asserted by William in his History; it is not mentioned by Florence.

⁶ It is evident that there were two stories, one that the body was thrown into a fen, the other that it was thrown into the Thames. Florence tries to combine the two; "Ipsius Haroldi corpus effodere et in gronnam projicere jussit: quod cum projectum fuisset, id extrahere, et in flumen Thamense mandavit projicere." This sort of translation does not seem so likely as the widely different translation of another Harold, the historical reality of which I shall have to maintain hereafter.

CHAP. VI. brought up by a fisherman, and received a second burial.
and buried again.

The large Danish population of London had a burial-place of their own without the walls of the city, the memory of which is still retained in the name of the Church of Saint Clement Danes. There Harold's body was again buried, secretly, we may suppose, though the act is spoken of as a tribute of honour paid by the Danes of London to the King whose accession to the throne was so largely their own act.¹

Harthacnut's second Danegeld. 1040-1.

No act could well have been more offensive to the Danes settled in England than these insults offered to the body of their own chosen prince. Harthacnut's next act was to incense all his subjects, English and Danish, by laying on another enormous Danegeld of about twenty-two thousand pounds, with another sum of more than eleven thousand pounds for thirty-two ships, probably a fresh contingent which had just come from Denmark.² He was now, before he had been a year on the throne, thoroughly hated.³ As

Godwine and Lyfing

if on purpose to increase his unpopularity, he next attacked the two leaders of the national party, Earl Godwine and

¹ Fl. Wig. "Brevi autem post tempore a quodam piscatore captum est et ad Danos allatum sub festinatione, in cœmeterio quod habuerunt Londoniæ sepultum est ab ipsis cum honore." So William more briefly. Bromton (933) says, "Sed piscatores postea cadaver in suis retibus prederunt, quod apud Sanctum Clementem humo iterum tradiderunt."

It is really worth while to transcribe the narrative of M. de Bonnechose (ii. 61); it is so amusingly coloured; "Le corps d'Harold, son frère, fut déterré par ses ordres, décapité, jeté dans un marais, puis dans la Tamise, et il exigea que le comte Godwin, principal ministre des volontés d'Harold, fût un des instruments de la vengeance exercée sur son cadavre et sur une population rebelle. Godwin cependant ne trouva pas, dans son empressement à obéir, une sûreté suffisante; la clameur publique s'élevait contre lui, et le désignait comme l'assassin d'Alfred frère utérin du nouveau roi; l'archevêque d'Yorck se porta son accusateur devant Hardi-Canut."

² Florence seems to put the two Danegelds together, but the Peterborough Chronicle (1039, 1040) clearly distinguishes them.

³ Florence here inserts the remark, from the Worcester and Abingdon Chronicles, "Quapropter omnibus qui prius adventum ejus desiderabant magnoperè, factus est exosus summoperè."

Bishop Lyfing. Archbishop Ælfric, who appears almost CHAP. VI. in the character of a spiritual Eadric, is said to have ac- accused of cused them to the King of being concerned in the death the death of his brother Ælfred. Some other persons unnamed of Ælfred. joined with him in bringing the charge.¹ Of the two 1040. defendants the Bishop was the easier victim. Lyfing lost his Bishoprick, which was given to his accuser to hold in plurality.² He recovered it however in the course of the next year, as the price, we are told, of money paid to the King.³ Whether the deposition of Lyfing was effected with any legal forms we are not told; but the Earl of the Trial and West-Saxons evidently underwent a regular trial before acquittal of the Witan. The proceedings form a curious illustration Godwine. of the jurisprudence of the age. The functions of witness, judge, and juror were not yet accurately distinguished, and compurgation,⁴ whenever compurgation could be had, was looked on as the most effectual proof of innocence. Godwine asserted his own innocence on oath, and his solemn plea of Not Guilty was confirmed by the oaths of most of the Earls and chief Thegns⁵ of England. We must not judge of the value of such an acquittal by the ideas of our own time. On a modern trial, some of Godwine's compurgators would have had to act as his judges; some would have been examined as witnesses to the facts; others might, at least in the case of a less illustrious defendant, have appeared as witnesses to character.

¹ Flor. Wig. in anno. "Accusantibus illos Ælfrico Eboracensi archiepiscopo et quibusdam aliis."

² Fl. Wig. "Episcopatum Wigornensem Livingo abstulit et Ælfrico dedit, sed sequenti anno ablatum Ælfrico, Livingo secum pacificato benigne reddidit."

³ Will. Malms. ii. 188. "Illum episcopatu expulit, sed post annum pecuniâ serenatus restituit."

⁴ Ib. "Godwinum quoque obliquis oculis intuitus, ad sacramentum purgationis compulit."

⁵ Flor. Wig. in anno. "Cum totius ferè Angliæ principibus et ministris dignioribus Regi juravit."

CHAP. VI. In the rude state of the Law in those times, these distinctions were not thought of. But it does not follow that substantial justice was not done. Godwine's acquittal was as solemn as any acquittal could be. All the chief men of England swore to their belief in his innocence. The only difference between such an acquittal and a modern acquittal on a trial before the House of Lords is that, in the ancient mode of procedure, the voices of those who of their own knowledge affirmed Godwine to be innocent, and the voices of those who accepted his innocence on their testimony, were all reckoned together. Godwine then was acquitted, after the most solemn trial provided by the jurisprudence of his own time. He is in fairness entitled to the full benefit of that acquittal. The judgement of a competent tribunal is always worth something, though its worth may be overbalanced by facts or probabilities the other way. There are those who hold, in defiance of all fact and reason, that Sir Thomas More and Anne Boleyn must have been guilty, because English Courts of Justice pronounced them to be guilty. I am surely asking much less if I ask that Godwine may be held to be innocent, because an English Court of Justice, whose verdict is outweighed by no facts or probabilities the other way, solemnly pronounced him to be innocent.¹

Value of
the ac-
quittal.

¹ I cannot resist giving some account of the grotesque legend into which the compurgation of Godwine has grown under the hands of the so-called Bromton (X Scriptt. 937, 8). It is transferred to the reign of Eadward. Godwine, it will be remembered (see above, p. 544), is, at his accession, in Denmark. Meanwhile Eadward comes over to England, he is crowned, and reigns justly and mercifully. Godwine, hearing of his justice and mercy, ventures to hope that the latter princely virtue may be extended to himself, and supplicates that he may be allowed to come over and plead his cause. This he does in a "Parliament," where the King with his Counts and "Barons" talk a considerable quantity of Norman law. Earl Leofric at last cuts the knot; It is clear that Godwine is guilty, but then he is the best born man in the land after the King himself—therefore it may be presumed, neither the son of Wulfnoth the herdsman nor yet the kinsman of the upstart Ealdorman Eadric—so he and his sons, and I and

One point specially to be noticed is the form of words which the only primary authority who records any form puts into the mouth of Godwine and his compurgators. They swear that it was not by Godwine's will or counsel that the Ætheling Ælfred was blinded, and that, whatever Godwine did in the matter, he did at the bidding of his Lord King Harold.¹ This is clearly an abridged, and it is most probably an inaccurate, report of the oath actually taken. It is clearly abridged, because when Godwine by implication confessed to have done something, he could not fail to explain more at large what it was that he confessed himself to have done. But such a form of words is consistent with the view that Godwine met Ælfred, or even that he arrested Ælfred, within his own Earldom, but that he had no hand in the barbarous cruelties which followed in a place out of his jurisdiction. But the mention of Harold as Godwine's Lord again steps in to throw doubt on the whole formula. The only character in which Harold could be called Godwine's Lord was that of superior Lord of all Britain, in which character he was the Lord rather of Harthacnut than of Godwine. Still, whatever doubts the formula may be

CHAP. VI.

Form of
oath put
into God-
wine's
mouth by
Florence.

eleven other nobles his kinsmen, will bring the King as much gold and silver as we each can carry, and the King shall forgive Earl Godwine and gave him his lands back again. To this singular way of observing his coronation oath to do justice the saintly monarch makes no objection; Earl Godwine takes his lands, and King Eadward takes the broad pieces. Perhaps they were the very pieces over which he afterwards saw the devil dancing.

¹ Flor. Wig. "Non sui consilii nec suæ voluntatis fuisse quod frater ejus cæcatus fuisset, sed dominum suum Regem Haroldum illum facere quod fecit jussisse."

Roger of Wendover (i. 478), seemingly following Florence, leaves out the clause in which Godwine says that he had acted by order of Harold. "Juravit quod neque ingenio suo nec voluntate frater ejus fuerat interemptus et oculis privatus." This is remarkable, as Roger (i. 474) asserts the complicity of Godwine with Harold's doings perhaps more strongly than any other writer.

CHAP. VI. open to, it has its worth. It points to the general probability that Godwine may have had a share in the events which led to the death of Ælfred, and yet not a guilty share.

Godwine
purchases
the favour
of Hartha-
cnut by
a magni-
ficent ship.

Another circumstance which, in our days, would at once throw suspicion upon the verdict proves nothing at all according to the ideas of those days. Ages after the time of Harthacnut, in times which by comparison seem as yesterday, English Judges did not scruple to receive presents from their suitors and English Sovereigns to receive presents from their subjects. It is always possible that such presents may be bribes in a guilty sense; it is always equally possible that they may not. It therefore proves nothing either way when we read that the Earl of the West-Saxons, solemnly acquitted by his peers, had still to buy his full restoration to the friendship of his principal Judge at the cost of a magnificent present. We have already seen how dear a possession a ship was in Danish eyes;¹ we have seen how acceptable a present it might be in English eyes.² We have seen too what an astonishing amount of adornment the warriors of the North lavished upon these cherished instruments, almost companions, of their warfare.³ Though we hear nothing of any warlike exploits of Harthacnut,⁴ he had enough of the Wiking in him for a well-equipped ship to be the most acceptable of all gifts.⁵ Godwine therefore gave Harthacnut a ship with a beak of gold, manned

¹ See above, p. 388.

² See above, p. 370.

³ See above, p. 393.

⁴ Except in one Danish Chronicle (*Chron. Erixi*, ap. Lang. i. 159), who ludicrously attributes to Harthacnut, not only his father's military legislation (see above, p. 491), but his mythical exploits in various parts of the world (see above, pp. 479, 504). "*Unde tempore suo super omnes Reges mundi terribilis et laudabilis exstitit. Transivit etiam cum Imperatore in Italiam ad domandum nationes exteras. Obiit autem in Angliâ.*"

⁵ The ship and its crew are described by Florence, 1040. William of Malmesbury, ii. 188.

with eighty chosen warriors armed in the most magnificent shape of the full panoply of the time. Each man had on each arm a golden bracelet of sixteen ounces weight; each was clad in a triple coat of mail; each bore on his head a helmet partly gilded; each was armed with all the weapons which could be needed in warfare of any kind.¹ Each soldier bore on his left arm a shield with gilded boss and studs; his right hand bore the javelin, the English *ategar*, for the distant skirmishing at the beginning of a battle. But each too was ready for the closest and most terrible fight. Each was girded with a sword with a gilded handle, and from each man's left shoulder hung, also adorned with gold and silver, the most fearful weapon of all, the Danish battle-axe.² This is our first mention³ of the weapon which Englishmen were, twenty-six years later, to wield with such deadly prowess upon the heights of Senlac, and which, after the lapse of a hundred and forty years, the descendants of English exiles were still found wielding in defence of the throne of Constantine and Justinian.⁴

Meanwhile all England was in commotion at the imposition of the Danegeld. Men had deemed that such imposts had passed away for ever in that Witenagemót of

CHAP. VI.

Arms
of the
soldiers.The Dan-
ish axe.

1066.

1203-4.

The Dane-
geld levied
by the
Housecarls.
1041.

¹ Will. Malm. "Ne singula enumerem armis omnibus instructos in quibus fulgor cum terrore certans sub auro ferrum occuleret."

² "Securis Danica" in both accounts.

³ Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 728 E) arms both West-Saxons and Mercians "gladiis et securibus *Amazonicis*." The Amazons are of course a flourish of Henry's own out of Horace, but the axes may very likely come from a ballad. The axe, as antiquarian researches show, was in use almost everywhere from the earliest times, but the earlier axes are something quite different from the vast two-handed weapons wielded at Stamfordbridge and Senlac. This last clearly supplanted the sword as the characteristic English weapon from about this time. See above, pp. 300, 430.

⁴ Villehardouin, c. 95. "Et li Griffon orent mis d'Englois et de Danois à totes les haches." Nikêtas, Alex. iii. (351 B. ed. Paris. 1647). εἰ καὶ πρὸς τῶν ἐπικούρων Ῥωμαῖοις Πισσαίων καὶ τῶν πελεκυφόρων βαρβάρων γενναϊότερον ἀπεκρούσθησαν, καὶ τραυματαῖαι οἱ πλείους ἀνέζευξαν.

Oxford where Cnut the Danish conqueror
Cnut the English King. No enemy was
Denmark, the old foe, was a sister Kingdome
the new foe, was hindered by her domestic
threatening any of her neighbours; the
Duncan before Durham had taught Scotland
the frontiers of the Imperial state.¹ But
such as had been heard of only in the darkest
hours of the reign of Æthelred. Taxes of this kind
always came in slowly,² and this particular tax came
in with especial slowness. Military force was needed to
extort payment, the Housecarls, who do not seem to have
been sent on such errands in the days of Cnut, were now
turned into tax-gatherers, and were sent into every shire
in England to collect the King's tribute. That soldiers
entrusted with such a duty behaved with insolence and
violence we might take for granted in any age. In
their conduct we may probably find the historical ground-
work for those wonderful tales of Danish oppression in
which later and rhetorical writers indulge. No doubt
this collection of the Danegeld was accompanied by much
oppression; but there is no evidence that it was oppres-
sion inflicted by Danes as Danes on Englishmen as
Englishmen. As far as we can see, the state of things
under Harthacnut must have been something like the state
of England under the Angevin Kings. The natives, of
whatever race, and the settlers who were fairly naturalized

¹ Brimton (so to call him) must have had some authority before him when he made the significant remark (X Scriptt. 93) "Iste Rex Harthacnut per totum tempus quo regnavit regnum Scotie subiecit."

² See above, pp. 382, 3.

³ Flor. Wig 1041. "Rex Anglorum Harthacnutus suas huscarlas misit per omnes regni sui provincias ad exigendum quod indixerat."

⁴ See above, p. 492

Anglorum Harthacnutus suas huscarlas
provincias ad exigendum quod indixerat

in the country, were all taxed in a way to which they were not used for the sake of the mere strangers who had come in the King's train.¹ We cannot suppose that a Danish citizen of London, or a Danish Thegn who had received a grant of lands from Cnut, was let off his share of the tribute on proof of his Danish birth. The discontent which was doubtless common to the whole Kingdom at last broke out in one particular quarter. The citizens of Worcester and the men of Worcestershire generally rose in revolt and attacked the Housecarls. Two of their number, Feader and Thurstan, fled, like the followers of Sigeferth and Morkere at Oxford,² to a tower of the minster.³ The people followed them to their hiding-place, and slew them. The murder deserved legal punishment, but Harthacnut preferred a form of chastisement for which unfortunately he could find precedents in the reigns of better princes than himself.⁴ He is said to have been further stirred up to vengeance by one who ought to have been the first to counsel mercy. Archbishop Ælfric had, as we have seen, received the Bishoprick of Worcester on the deposition of Lyfing;⁵ it would seem that the citizens refused to receive him.⁶ They were doubtless attached to

The House-
carls
killed at
Worcester.
May 4,
1041.

¹ "Ut piratis suis necessaria ministrarent," says Roger of Wendover, i. 479.

² See above, p. 411.

³ Flor. Wig. in anno. "In cujusdam turris Wigornensis monasterii solario." One would almost think that, in this case, the principal tower of the church is not meant.

⁴ Besides the ravaging of districts as chastisement for treason or defection in war (see above, pp. 407, 415), we find a similar case even in the peaceful reign of Eadgar. See above, p. 67.

⁵ See above, p. 573.

⁶ So I understand William of Malmesbury, De Gest. Pont. iii. p. 154; "Quin et Wigorniensibus pro repulsâ episcopatus infensus auctor Hardecnuto fuit ut, quod illi pertinaciùs exactoribus regionum vectigalium obstiterant, urbem incenderet, fortunas civium abraderet." If the "repulsa episcopatus" meant the restoration of the see to Lyfing by the King's act, this could be no ground of offence on the part of the citizens of Worcester.

CHAP. VI. their own patriotic pastor, and they may well have been unwilling to be again made an appendage to the Northumbrian metropolis. In revenge for this injury, Ælfric, we are told, counselled the terrible punishment which Harthacnut now decreed for his flock. The offending city and shire were to feel the full extremity of military vengeance; the town was to be burned, the country harried, and the inhabitants, as far as might be, killed.

The Earls
sent
against
Worcester.

[1051.]

For this purpose Harthacnut sent nearly all his Housecarls—unhappily we are not told their numbers—under the command of all the chief men of England. The three great Earls, Godwine of Wessex, Leofric of Mercia, Siward of Northumberland,¹ and their subordinate Earls, among whom Thuri of the Middle-Angles or Eastern part of Mercia,² and Ranig of the Magesætas or Herefordshire³ are specially mentioned, were all sent against the one city of Worcester. Ten years later, when Eadward the Confessor required the like chastisement to be inflicted on the town of Dover, Godwine utterly refused to have any hand in such a business, and distinctly asserted the right of every Englishman to a legal trial. But in that case the alleged crime had been done in Godwine's own Earldom, and no doubt Godwine's power was much less under Harthacnut than it became under Eadward. As things now stood, it was hardly possible to disobey, unless the Earls had been prepared for the extreme measure of deposing

¹ On the dates of Siward's promotions, see below, p. 587.

² Florence calls him "Comes Mediterraneorum." His Earldom included Huntingdonshire. See a charter of Harthacnut and Emma addressed "Turri comiti" (Cod. Dipl. vi. 192). I do not find any undoubted signatures of this Earl, unless he is the same as Dord [Dored?], who signs several charters of Cnut as "Minister" and "Miles."

³ See above, p. 476. "Hrani dux" signs as early as 1023. Cod. Dipl. iv. 27. We find him holding a Scirgemót with Bishop Æthelstan and others in Cod. Dipl. iv. 54. He there bears the title of Ealdorman, and we find that his son, like some other English-born sons of Danish settlers, bore the English name of Eadwine.

the King. In fact England now for the first time felt the consequences of the existence of a standing army. We shall hereafter see what the Housecarls could do for England under a patriotic King; we now see what they could do against Englishmen at the bidding of a rapacious tyrant. It was not at the head of the forces of their several governments that the Earls were bidden to attack the offending city. Those forces would have taken some time to collect, and, when they were collected, they would doubtless have sympathized with their intended victims. The King had now at his command a body of Janissaries, which could march at a moment's notice, a force bound to him by a personal tie, and ready to carry out his personal will in all things. It was no doubt deemed a great stroke of policy to implicate in the deed all the chief men of the land, English and Danish, by putting them at the head of the King's personal force. But it seems plain that the Earls showed little zeal in the bloody errand on which they were sent. Placed as they were, they could hardly avoid doing much mischief to property, but they were evidently determined to shed as little blood as possible. Their approach was well known¹—most likely they took care that it should be well known—to those against whom they came. The inhabitants of the shire took shelter in various places, while the men of the city itself entrenched² themselves in an island of the Severn, whose name of Beverege reminds us of one of the losses which our national *fauna* has sustained.³ They held out for four days; on the fifth

CHAP. VI.

The Housecarls.

Worcester
burned and
the shire
ravaged.

¹ Fl. Wig. "Paucos vel à civibus vel provincialibus ceperunt aut occiderunt, quia præcognito adventu eorum, provinciales quoque locorum fugerant."

² Fl. Wig. "Munitione factâ, tamdiu se viriliter adversus suos inimicos defenderant."

³ The existence of the beaver in Britain within historical memory seems proved by such names as Beverege, Beverley, perhaps, but less likely, Beverstone (Byferesstan, Chron. Petrib. 1048) in Gloucestershire. Giraldus

CHAP. VI.

peace was made, and they were allowed to go ^{where they} would. But the city was burned, and the army ^{marched} away with great plunder. The vengeance of Har ^{thacnut} and Ælfric was thus partly satisfied, and the Arch ^{bishop,} having thus witnessed the devastation of the dioc ^{se} upon which he had been forced, seems to have been ^{not un-} willing to surrender the see to its lawful possessor. As Ælfric still held it at the time of the burning of the city,¹ it seems to follow that Lyfing's reappointment ^{hap-}pened soon after this conclusion of peace. And it is a ^{natural} conjecture that the restoration of the popular Prelate and the exclusion of the intruding Metropolitan was ^{one of} the articles agreed on between the Earls and the citizens. Worcester has been fortunate in its Bishops in more ^{than} one great crisis of our history. Side by side with ^{God-}wine we find Lyfing; side by side with Harold we ^{find} Wulfstan; and in later times, when the part of God ^{wine} is played again by Simon of Montfort, we find Walter of Cantelupe walking in the steps of Lyfing, and say ^{ing} [1265.] mass and hearing the confession of the martyred Ear ^l on the morning of the fight of Evesham.²

Harthacnut had still another great crime in store, ^{but} the burning of Worcester seems to have set the final ^{seal} to the hatred and infamy which he had incurred ^{among} all classes of his people.³ It may have been a desperate effort to win back some measure of popularity which ^{now}

Cambrensis (Topog. Hibern. i. 21. p. 709. Camden) speaks of beavers in his time in the Teifi, but in the Teifi only.

¹ "Ælfrico adhuc Wigornensem pontificatum tenente," says Florence, a significant expression, which seems silently to confirm the charge brought against Ælfric of being the author of the whole business.

² Robert of Gloucester, p. 558;

"þe bissop Walter of Wurcetre asoiled hom alle þere, and prechede hom, þat hii adde of deþ þe lasse fere."

³ Will. Malms. ii. 188. "Contumeliam famæ, et amoris suo detrimentum ingessit."

HARTHACNUT RECALLS EADWARD

led him to send for his half-brother Eadward.¹ He could have had no personal affection for brother whom he had never seen, and the influence of Emma would hardly have been exercised in Eadward's favour. But the events of the next year showed at popular feeling of the ancient king had secured but this feeling of Harold childless; he

ing was now veering of his sons in the direction of Cnut the successful successor in case of Eadward. The recall of Eadward could hardly have provided him with a successor in case of Eadward. Harthacnut also, young as he was, in failing health, be some say tell us the Kingdom.⁴ Eadward at once provided him with a successor in case of Eadward. Harthacnut also, young as he was, in failing health, be some say tell us the Kingdom.⁴ Eadward at once provided him with a successor in case of Eadward. Harthacnut also, young as he was, in failing health, be some say tell us the Kingdom.⁴

The recall of Eadward could hardly have provided him with a successor in case of Eadward. Harthacnut also, young as he was, in failing health, be some say tell us the Kingdom.⁴ Eadward at once provided him with a successor in case of Eadward. Harthacnut also, young as he was, in failing health, be some say tell us the Kingdom.⁴

ing was now veering of his sons in the direction of Cnut the successful successor in case of Eadward. The recall of Eadward could hardly have provided him with a successor in case of Eadward. Harthacnut also, young as he was, in failing health, be some say tell us the Kingdom.⁴ Eadward at once provided him with a successor in case of Eadward. Harthacnut also, young as he was, in failing health, be some say tell us the Kingdom.⁴

¹ The coming of Eadward and his friendly reception by Harthacnut is asserted by all the Chronicles and by Florence; they do not distinctly assert that Harthacnut sent for him, but it is surely a natural inference. Willm. Malmesbury however (ii. 188) asserts by the Encomiast, p. 36. Eadward came invited; "Germanum fraternalis necessitudinis, natale solum, annos peregrinationis tædio, in excipiens indulgentissimè retinuit." Harthacnut was therefore born in 1018 and 1013, when he visited Canterbury as a child. Chron. Wig. * Cnut married Emma in 1017. Harthacnut was therefore born in 1018 and 1013, when he visited Canterbury as a child. Chron. Wig. * Will. Pict. sp. Maseres, 39. Harthacnut was therefore born in 1018 and 1013, when he visited Canterbury as a child. Chron. Wig. * Enc. Emm. 36. Harthacnut was therefore born in 1018 and 1013, when he visited Canterbury as a child. Chron. Wig. vardum, rogans ut veniens secum correptus amore, nuncios mittit quite another motive; "Edvardum obtineret regnum." Saxo (202) a pater ex Immæ matrimonio sustulit, in regni societatem adsciscit quod fraterno illi adfectu coleret, sed ut ejus ambitionem muni- ac liberalitate præcurreret, regnique partem potitum totum cupere hiberet."

CHAP. VI. brother's court, but no English writer describes him as invested with any administrative office.¹

One thing however Eadward did, which, had men's eyes been open to the future, would have seemed to them a sure sign of the evil to come. Emma had brought with her Hugh the French churl, who betrayed Exeter to the Dane.² So her son, even when returning as a private man, brought with him the advanced guard of that second swarm of strangers who were finally to bring the land into bondage. Among other Frenchmen, Eadward brought with him to England his nephew Ralph, the son of his sister Godgifu by her first husband Drogo of Mantes.³ He must now have been a mere youth; but he lived to be gorged with English wealth and honours, to bring his feeble force to oppose the champions of England, and to be branded in our history as "the timid Earl,"⁴ who sought to work improvements in English warfare, and himself turned and fled at the first sight of an armed enemy.

The North-
humbrian
Earls.

The latest internal events of the reign of Harthacnut call our thoughts once more to the great Northumbrian Earldom. They set vividly before us the unrestrained barbarism of that portion of the Kingdom. I have already described the strange career of Uhtred, and how he at last died, by the connivance of Cnut in his early days, but by the personal vengeance of an enemy whom he had himself unwisely omitted to slay.⁵ A fate almost literally the same now overtook one of his descendants and successors, whose story introduces us more directly to one

¹ Chron. Ab. et Wig. "He wunode þa swa on his broðor hirede, þa hwile þe he leofode." Fl. Wig. "A fratre suo Heardecanuto Rege susceptus honorificè in curiâ suâ mansit."

² See above, p. 316.

³ Ord. Vit. ap. Duchesne, 655. C. Hist. Rams. c. 116.

⁴ "Timidus Dux Radulfus," says Florence, 1055.

⁵ See above, p. 416.

of the great actors of the next reign. Uhtred, as we have seen, was succeeded by his brother Eadwulf Cutel, at first, it would seem, under the superiority of the Danish Eric.¹ The reign of Eadwulf was both short and inglorious; he did not long survive the defeat of the forces of his Earldom at Carham.² He was succeeded, but in the Bernician Earldom only, by his nephew Ealdred, a son of Uhtred by the daughter of Bishop Ealdhun.³ The new Earl presently put to death Thurbrand the murderer of his father. Whether this was done by way of public justice or of private assassination does not appear, and the savage manners of the Northumbrian Danes probably drew no very wide distinction between the two. But at all events the deadly feud went on from generation to generation. A bitter enmity raged between Ealdred and Thurbrand's son Carl, evidently a powerful Thegn.⁴ The two, we are told, were constantly seeking each other's lives.⁵ Common friends contrived to reconcile them, and, like Cnut and Eadmund, they were more than reconciled; they became sworn brethren. In this character they undertook to go together on a pilgrimage to Rome, but this pious under-

CHAP. VI.

Eadwulf
Cutel.Ealdred of
Bernicia
puts Thur-
brand to
death,

¹ See above, pp. 416, 449. Mr. Robertson (i. 95. ii. 442) seems to confine the Northumbrian government of Eric to Deira, while he extends his frontier southward to Watling-Street. But the fourfold division of England implies that Eric ruled over all Northumberland. On the other hand, Simeon in a marked way confines the government of Ealdred, the successor of Eadwulf, to Bernicia. The obvious inference is that Eadwulf ruled at first in Bernicia only and under the superiority of Eric, but that, on Eric's banishment, he succeeded to the government of all Northumberland immediately under the King. Simeon gives us no dates, and Siward's accession to Deira may have followed the death of Eadwulf Cutel. Everything looks as if the reign of Ealdred was very short.

² See above, p. 496.

³ Sim. Dun. ap. X Scriptt. p. 81. "Aldredus, quem prædictus Comes Ucthredus genuerat ex Ecfridâ Alduni Episcopi filiâ, . . . solius Northumbriæ comitatum suscepit, patrisque sui interfectorem interfecit Turebrandum." "Northumbria" is here used in the most modern sense.

⁴ A Carl, apparently the same, signs several charters of Cnut.

⁵ Sim. Dun. ap. X Scriptt. 81. De Gestis, 204.

CHAP. VI. taking, like so many other undertakings of that age, hindered by stress of weather.¹ They returned to Northumberland together. The reconciliation on Ealdred's part had been made in good faith; not so on the part of Carl. He invited the Earl to his house, he received and is murdered by Carl. He feasted him splendidly, and then, we are told, slew him in a wood, according to the most approved formula of assassination.² Ealdred was succeeded in Bernicia by his brother Eadwulf. The succession of the Earls of York or Deira it is less easy to trace, but, at some time before this year, the Southern Earldom must have come into possession of the famous Siward, whom we have already seen acting as its Earl at the burning of Worcester. Siward, surnamed Digera or the Strong,⁴ was a Dane by birth. His gigantic stature, his vast strength and personal prowess, made him a favourite hero of romance. He boasted of the same marvellous pedigree as Ulf; perhaps indeed Siward and Ulf might claim a common ancestor on the non-human side.⁵ His name is attached

Eadwulf of
Bernicia.
10381

Siward of
Deira.

¹ Sim. Dun. 81. "Diutina maris tempestate impediti, coeptum iter relinquentes, domum sunt reversi."

² See above, p. 356. This story has a mythical sound; still a hunting-party would give unusual opportunities both to commit such a murder, and afterwards to represent it as an accident. The fate of William Rufus is a familiar example. Simeon (p. 81) says that, in his time, the place of the murder was marked by a small stone cross.

³ See above, p. 580.

⁴ Will. Malms. iii. 253, copied in the Life of Waltheof, Chron. Angl. Norm. ii. 112.

⁵ The legend of Siward (Sigeweard) will be found in Langebek, iii. 288, also in the Chroniques Anglo-Normandes, ii. 104. It might perhaps be hard to reconcile the pedigree as there given with the pedigree of Ulf. "Ursus genuit Spratlingus, Spratlingus Ulsium [Ulfium?]; Ulsius Beorn," Beorn being Siward's father. This of course comes from Florence (see above, p. 468) or from the same source as Florence, but there is something specially grotesque in making Siward a son of Biorn Ulfsson, who was killed by Swegen the son of Godwine in 1049. The bear who was the ancestor of Siward and Ulf had also, it would seem, known ursine descendants; at least so I understand the legend of Hereward, Chroniques

to several charters of the reign of Cnut,¹ but he does not appear to have risen to Earl's rank in his time. He married Æthelflæd,² a daughter of Earl Ealdred, a marriage which seems to have been his only connexion with the house of the Northumbrian Earls. Whether he laid any claim to the Bernician Earldom in right of his wife it is hard to say; he was at any rate ready to abet the criminal designs of Harthacnut against its present possessor. Eadwulf seems to have been a ruler of more vigour than his uncle of the same name; at least we hear, though rather darkly, of a devastating campaign carried on by him against the Britons, a name which here can mean only the inhabitants of Strathclyde.³ He was however in ill odour at the court of Harthacnut; probably he and the men of his Earldom had been among

Angl. Norm. ii. 7. Siward, in the story, after slaying dragons and other such exploits, comes to England in the reign of Eadward; he then, under very odd circumstances, kills one Tostig, Earl of Huntingdon, and gets his Earldom. The Church of Saint Clement Danes (see above, p. 572), was built, we are told, to commemorate the slain followers of Tostig. Afterwards, when an invasion from Norway was threatening (1045?), Siward was made Earl over Northumberland, *Cumberland*, and Westmorland. The same story is found in Bromton, 945, only there "Bernus," father of Siward, is himself son of the bear. Such stuff would not be worth mentioning, had not Sir Francis Palgrave (Engl. Comm. ii. ccxcvii.) inferred from it the existence of an historical Tostig, Earl of Huntingdon. See above, p. 461. It is, I think, plain that the Tostig of this story (who is, not indeed brother, but brother-in-law of Eadward's Queen Eadgyth) is meant for the son of Godwine, and that the slaying of Eadwulf by Siward has got confounded with the career of Tostig in Northumberland, and his expulsion from the Earldom.

¹ A Siward, seemingly the same, signs as "Minister" in 1019 (Cod. Dipl. iv. 9) and 1032 (iv. 39); also a doubtful charter of Archbishop Æthelnoth (iv. 53) as "Miles."

² Ealdred (Sim. Dun. 82) had five daughters, three of whom were named "Elfleda," I suppose Æthelflæd. Of these Siward married one, who was the mother of the famous Waltheof. Did the two other Æthelflæds die in infancy?

³ Sim. Dun. De Gestis, 204. "Qui, quum superbiâ extolleretur, Britones satis atrociter devastavit."

CHAP. VI. the foremost in pressing the claims of Harold. He now came to make his peace with the King, and was received by him to full friendship.¹ But Harthacnut was as little bound by his plighted faith as Carl. As Cnut had allowed or commanded the slaughter of Uhtred at the hands of Thurbrand, Harthacnut now allowed or commanded the slaughter of Eadwulf at the hands of Siward the husband of his niece. The murderer was forthwith invested with the whole Earldom of Northumberland from the Humber to the Tweed.² Oswulf, the young son of Eadwulf, did not obtain any share of the ancient heritage of his house, till he was invested with a subordinate government for a single moment on the very eve of the Norman Conquest.

Eadwulf
murdered
by Siward,
who ob-
tains all
Northum-
berland.
1041.

Oswulf
son of
Eadwulf.

1065.

Death of
Bishop
Eadmund.
Hartha-
cnut sells
the See of
Durham to
Eadred.
1041-2.

The Bernician Earldom was thus disposed of. Early in the next year Harthacnut had also the disposal of the Bernician Bishoprick. The King was, it would seem, keeping the Midwinter festival at Gloucester,³ and Bishop Eadmund was in attendance. He died while at the court, and his body was taken to Durham for burial. Harthacnut presently sold the see to one Eadred, who seems to have given about equal offence to the monks by his simony, and by the fact

¹ Sim. Dun. De Gestis, 204. "Sed tertio post anno, quum ad Hardecanutum reconciliandus in pace venisset, interfectus est à Siwardo." So the Abingdon and Worcester Chronicles, 1041; "And on þison gear eac swāc Harðacnut Eadulfe under gryðe, and he was þa wedloga." This independent statement gives the strongest possible confirmation to Simeon's whole story. Florence does not mention the murder of Eadwulf.

² Sim. Dun. u. s. "Siwardus, qui post illum totius provincie Northanhymbrorum, id est ab Humbrā usque Twedam, comitatum habuit."

³ Sim. Hist. Dun. iii. 9. p. 33. "Defunctus est in Glocestre, quum apud Regem ibidem moraretur." Gloucester was, at least under William the Conqueror, the usual place for the Midwinter festival. Chron. Petrib. 1087. Eadward also is found at Gloucester somewhat earlier in the year. Flor. Wig. 1043.

of his being a secular priest.¹ It is set down as a mark of divine vengeance that he did not live to take full possession of the see. At the time appointed for his installation, he fell suddenly ill, and died in the tenth month from his nomination.²

CHAP. VI.
Death of
Eadred.
1042.

The reign of Harthacnut was now drawing to an end. As far as it is possible to make out anything from the tangled mazes of Scandinavian history and legend, it would seem that he was engaged in another war with Magnus after he had fixed himself in England.³ He had left as his lieutenant in Denmark his cousin Swend, the son of Ulf and Estrith. Swend came to England for help against Magnus,⁴ and was despatched to Denmark a second time with a fleet. He was defeated by the Norwegian King, and came back to England.⁵ But he found his royal cousin no more. Harthacnut died during his absence by a death most befitting a prince whose chief merit was to have provided four meals a day for his courtiers. "This year," say the Chronicles, "died Harthacnut as he at his drink stood."⁶ It was at the marriage-feast of Tofig the Proud, a great Danish Thegn, who held the office of standard-bearer,⁷ with Gytha, the

War with
Magnus;
defeat of
Swend
Estrithson.
1042.

Death of
Hartha-
cnut.
June 8,
1042.

¹ Simeon (Hist. Dun. iii. 9) says, "Præsulatum illius ecclesie primus ex ordine clericali festinavit obtinere." Eadmund was a secular priest at the time of his election, but he became a monk before his consecration. Ib. c. 6. See above, p. 565.

² So I understand the words (Sim. Dun. u. s.), "Intraturus quippe ecclesiam, subita infirmitate corripitur, decidensque in lectum, decimo mense moritur."

³ So at least it would appear from Adam of Bremen, ii. 74. "Magnus statim invadens Daniam, possedit duo regna, Hardechnut Rege Danorum cum exercitu morante in Angliâ." But it is hard to make this agree with the Saga of Magnus, which speaks of no occupation of Denmark by Magnus till after Harthacnut's death.

⁴ Adam, ii. 73.

⁵ Ib. 74.

⁶ Chronn. Ab. et Wig. "Her forðferde Harðacnut swa þæt he æt his drince stod."

⁷ I shall speak more fully of the Waltham History, the "De Inventione Sanctæ Crucis," when I come to the great foundation of Harold. All that

CHAP. VI. daughter of Osgod Clapa, a man who fills a considerable space in the annals of the next reign.¹ Tofig is chiefly memorable as the first beginner of that great foundation at Waltham which is so inseparably connected with the memory of our last native King. He held large estates in Somersetshire, Essex, and elsewhere. According to the legend, a miraculous crucifix was found on his lordship of Lutegarsbury, in Somersetshire, on the top of the peaked hill from which the place in later times derived its name of Montacute.² For the reception of this revered relic he built a church on his estate of Waltham in Essex, and made a foundation for two priests. The place was then a mere wilderness, unmarked by any town, village, or church; Tofig had simply a hunting-seat in the forest. But, along with the erection of the church, he collected a certain number of inhabitants on the spot,³ and thus founded the town as well as the minster of

is known of Tofig is collected by Professor Stubbs in his edition of that tract. Nothing but local partiality could describe him as "Tovi le Prude, qui totius Angliæ post Regem primus, *stallere*, vexillifer Regis, monarchiam gubernabat." (c. 7. cf. c. 14.) Professor Stubbs does not seem quite clear as to his being staller, but he was certainly an important person. He appears in Florence as "Danicus et præpotens vir Tovius, Pruda cognomento." He signs many charters of Cnut, one of them in 1033 (Cod. Dipl. iv. 43) distinctly as "Tovi Pruda." He appears also with the same surname in Cod. Dipl. iv. 54, where he is sent by Cnut on a special mission into Herefordshire. The name was needed to distinguish him from two namesakes, "Tovi hwita" and "Tovi reada," who sign in 1024. Cod. Dipl. iv. 31. "Tofig minister," who signs under Eadward in 1054 (Cod. Dipl. iv. 133), and who was Sheriff of Somersetshire between 1061 and 1066 (see Cod. Dipl. iv. 171, 197, 199), must, if the Waltham narrative be at all accurate, be a different man.

¹ "Osgodus Clapa, magnæ vir potentie," says Florence. The Waltham writer (c. 13) corrupts Clapa into Scalp, and his daughter's name into Glitha.

² De Inv. c. 1.

³ Ib. c. 10. The first inhabitants, we are told, were sixty-six persons who were cured by the relic, and who devoted themselves to its honour. "De quibus . . . in primis instituta est villa Walthamensis, nam antea nihil erat in loco nisi vile domicilium ad succurrendum quum causâ venandi accederet illuc heros ille."

Waltham. This was in the days of Cnut.¹ Tofig must CHAP. VI. have been an elderly man at the time of his marriage with Gytha,—his eulogist indeed tells us that his youth was renewed like that of the eagle.² He had a son who was of an age to take a share in public affairs, and a grandson who was able to hold considerable offices a few years later.³ Gytha then can hardly fail to have been his second wife.⁴ Her bridal, at her father's house at Lambeth,⁵ was honoured with the presence of the King. As Harthacnut arose at the wedding-feast to propose the health of the bride,⁶ he fell to the ground in a fit accompanied by frightful struggles,⁷ and was carried out speechless by those who were near him. He died, and his body was carried to Winchester and buried by that of his father Cnut in the Old Minster.⁸ With him the direct line of Cnut came to an end. The times were such that the land could not long abide without a King. Even before the burial of Harthacnut another great national solemnity had taken place. If Swend cherished any hopes of the English succession, they vanished when, on his return to England, he found a son of Æthelred firmly established on the throne of his

¹ De Inv. 1. "*Regnante Cnuto et Anglis imperante.*"

² Ib. 7. "*Ei præ gaudio à senectute et senio [a subtle distinction] sicut aquilæ, juvenus renovatur.*"

³ Of his son Æthelstan—mark, as in the case of Ranig and Eadwine (see above, p. 580), the English name—and his grandson Esegar we shall hear in the next reign. On the chronology see Professor Stubbs' preface, p. xxviii.

⁴ Tofig must have died soon after his marriage. See De Inv. 14. Perhaps he shared the fate of Lewis the Twelfth.

⁵ Chron. Petrib. et Flor. Wig. in anno.

⁶ Fl. Wig. "*Dum . . . lætus, sospes, et hilaris, cum sponsâ prædictâ et quibusdam viris bibens staret.*"

⁷ Chronn. Ab. et Wig. "*Mid egeslicum anginne.*" Fl. Wig. "*Miserabili casu.*"

⁸ Chronn. Petr. et Cant. The latter adds, "*His moder for his sawle gief into niwan mynstre S. Valentines heafod ðas martires.*"

CHAP. VI. fathers. "Before the King buried were, all folk chose
Eadward
chosen
King.
June,
1042.

Eadward to King at London."¹

I have thus gone through the whole of that portion of my history which I look upon as introductory to its

¹ The circumstances of Eadward's election I reserve for my next Chapter. I wish now only to dispose of a silly legend, which has found a place in the text of Thierry (i. 179) and also in that of Mr. St. John (Four Conquests, ii. 127). According to Bromton (934) and Knighton (2326), the English, wearied with the oppressions of the Danes under Harthacnut (see above, p. 492), rose against them after his death, and drove them out by force. Knighton calls the leader of the revolt Howne, and his forces *Howneher* [Hunanhere]. Thierry makes Godwine the leader instead of Howne. M. de Bonnechose (Quatre Conquêtes, ii. 70-2), though seeing the general absurdity of the story, admits it so far as to accept an expulsion of the Housecarls. Saxo (202, 3) has a more wonderful tale than all. He has nothing to say about Howne or about Godwine. Harold, the son of Godwine, is the deliverer (Danicæ oppressionis simulque domesticæ libertatis auctor). He procures that the Danish forces throughout England should be invited to banquets in different places, so that they are all slain in one night. Of all this there is not a word in any trustworthy writer; the only passage which looks at all like it is a rhetorical expression in the Life of Eadward ("Reducto die afflictis Anglis barbaricâ servitute redemptionis suæ jubilæo," p. 394), which however probably merely refers to the extinction of the foreign dynasty, and the accession of a native King. Any one who has had any experience of the growth of mythical and romantic tales will soon see what is the origin of this legend. It is plainly nothing in the world but the Massacre of Saint Brice moved still further out of its place than it had already been moved by Roger of Wendover (see above, p. 344), and further mixed up with the legend of the death of Ælfred, with which it is connected by both Bromton and Knighton. Knighton's "Howne" is clearly Roger's "Huna" over again. Everything in our authentic narratives makes us believe that the election of Eadward was perfectly peaceful. A general expulsion or massacre of Danes is simply ridiculous; even an expulsion of the Housecarls is supported by no kind of evidence. The Housecarls of Harthacnut no doubt became the Housecarls of Eadward, and the saintly King, if Godwine had not been at hand to restrain him, was as ready to send them against Dover as Harthacnut had been to send them against Worcester.

A more marvellous version than all is to be found in the Life of Eadward in French verse, 532-581 (Luard, pp. 40, 41). Here the Danes, after committing the usual atrocities, rebel against *Harthacnut*, who raises an English army against them, and, after much fighting, overcomes them. Such wild shapes did our history take when it fell into the hands of strangers.

CHAP. VI.

of York and Ely, are fast growing into maturity. Harold Hardrada is already pursuing his wild career of knight-errantry in distant lands, and is astonishing the world by his exploits in Russia and in Sicily, at Constantinople and at Jerusalem. Swend Estrithson is still a wanderer, not startling men by wonders of prowess like Harold, but schooling himself and gathering his forces for the day when he could establish a permanent dynasty in his native land. In our own land, the younger warriors of the Conquest, Eadwine and Morcere and Waltheof and here, were probably born, but they must still have been in their cradles or in their mothers' arms. But, among the leaders of Church and State, Ealdred, who lived to see the crown on the head both of Harold and of William, is already a great Prelate, Abbot of the great house of Tewkesbury, soon to succeed the patriot Lyfing in the chair of Worcester. Stigand, climbing to greatness by slower steps, is already the chosen counsellor of Edward, a candidate for whatever amount of dignity and influence such a post may open to him. Wulfstan, destined to survive them all, has begun that career of quiet home-ness, neither seeking for, nor shrinking from, responsibility in temporal matters, which distinguishes him among the political and military Prelates of that age. In the house of Godwine that group of sons and daughters were springing up who for a moment promised to become the royal line of England. Eadgyth was growing into those royal harms of mind and person which won for her the heart of all Gyrrh, save that of the King who called her his wife. t have been on the verge of manhood; Sweegen and Harold were already men, bold and vigorous, ready to march d were father's bidding, and before long to affect their destiny of their country for evil and for good. Beyond the sea, William, still a boy in years but a man in conduct and

counsel, is holding his own among the storms of a troubled minority, and learning those arts of the statesman and the warrior which fitted him to become the wisest ruler of Normandy, the last and greatest Conqueror of England. The actors in the great drama are ready for their parts; the ground is gradually clearing for the scene of their performance. The great struggle of nations and tongues and principles in which each of them had his share, the struggle in which William of Normandy and Harold of England stand forth as worthy rivals for the noblest of prizes, will form the subject of the next, the chief and central, portion of my history.

APPENDIX.

THE USE OF THE WORD "ENGLISH."

My readers will doubtless have observed the text, expressly speaking of the whole, I invariably use the word "English" instead of "Saxon" or "Anglo-Saxon," which are more commonly used by the inhabitants of Britain. I do this advisedly, on more grounds than one. I hold to be a sound rule to speak of a nation, as the name by which it called itself. This one would be enough for using the word "English" alone, and no other. besides this, the "Anglo-Saxons" leads to various confusion about "Saxons" and miscommunication on that ground.

I am not aware of any instance in which a Teutonic bitant of Britain, living before the Norman Conquest, speaking in his own tongue of the whole nation formed by the union of the various Teutonic tribes in Britain, uses the word "Saxon." "Engle," "Angelcyn," are the words always used. The only exceptions, if we can call them exceptions, are two charters (see above, pp. 145, 148) in which the King of English is called "King of the Anglo-Saxons." Of these I am not aware that the word "Anglo-Saxon" is ever used except in the royal style, and even there English writings, it is very rare. It is quite certain that the

"Anglo-Saxon" was not used, any more than the word "Saxon," as the ordinary name of the nation. An inhabitant of one of the real Saxon settlements might indeed call himself a Saxon as opposed to his Anglian or Jutish neighbours. But even in this case it is remarkable that we very rarely find the word "Saxon" used alone. It is almost always coupled with one of its geographical adjuncts "West," "East," or "South." Cuthred's army at Burford (see p. 39) is not spoken of as the "Saxon" but the "West-Saxon" host, even though its adversaries were Angles. But the word "Saxon" is never used, in the native tongue, to express either the whole nation or any part of it which was not strictly Saxon. On the other hand, the words "Engle" and "Angelcyn" are constantly used to express, not only the whole nation, but parts of it which were not strictly Anglian. The Chronicle tells us that Hengest and Horsa were strictly, not Angles, but Jutes; but their followers are called "Engle" (473), and Teutonic settlers as a whole are called "Angelcyn" (449). A single passage in the Chronicles (505), which has another shall have presently to speak of as most distinctly an exception which proves the rule. "Engle," in short, in native speech, is the name of the whole nation, of which the "Seaxe" are part. On the other hand, for reasons which I have already stated (p. 13), all the Teutonic settlers in Britain have always been known to their Celtic neighbours as "Saxons." They were so in the fifth century; they are so still. In the Pictish Chronicle, for instance, Lothian is always "Saxonia." On the continent, stated before the Teutonic tribes in Britain were fully consolidated into one Kingdom, the words "Saxones" and "Angli" are used to have been used almost indifferently to describe them. As Gregory the Great calls the Jutish Æthelberht "Rex Anglorum" (Ecclesiastical History, i. 32), so Eginhard speaks of certain Northumbrians, who were strictly Angles, as Saxons. Ealdwine, who was certainly a Northumbrian, is called (Vita Eadwini, c. 25) "Saxonici generis homo," and one Ealdwulf, who seems to have been a Northumbrian, appears (Annals, 808) as "Britannia natione Saxo." But, after the nation was consolidated, this loose way of speaking died out, and for

THE USE OF THE WORD "ENGLISH."

spoke of us as we spoke of ourselves. The French and German writers of the tenth and eleventh centuries, as far as I am acquainted with them, always call our nation "Angli." I assert still more positively that the opposition between "Saxon" and "Norman," so commonly made by modern writers, is never found in any speaking of the days of any nation. The rule this head du- In the English Chronicles, in legal documents, and in the yeux Tapestry, opposition is made between "French" and "English." In Latin writers, King's men, French and those on the Norman side, the and "Saxons" are not "English," form an exhaustive division positively what may be the earliest instance of the usage; is found distinctly in Robert of Gloucester, who opposes "Normans" and "Saxons" exactly as Thierry does, in verses of the epilogue Thierry has not chosen for the epilogue of his land, work; "Of þe Normannes beþ þys hey men, þat understonde." (Vol. i. p. 363. e)

And þe lowe men of Saxons, as yeh and I beþ of his lond, laxity of the use of the words that even the native use in Latin writings as in those which are composed in the tongue. Native authorities, follow the Welsh usage, or translating from, in positions where, if they had been speaking in their "Saxon," they would certainly as far as I know, word "Angli." is one instance, and, as they have used the word "Angli." the Welsh usage extended itself into the very speech. In the entry in the Chronicles under the year 500, word "Saxon" does occur in the wider sense. But the word "Saxon" is not used by the Angle or Saxon himself, nor is it put in mouth of any Welsh Bishop; It occurs in a speech Augustine to the Seaxena Bishops; "Gif Wealas nellað sibb us, þy sculon set þe invasion of the Anglian Ethel was accomplished by the hands forwarðan," a prediction Here is a story, probably preserved by Welsh tradition, in

a Roman speaking to Welshmen is made to adopt a Welsh of speech. The contrast between this passage and the ordinary language of the Chronicles makes the ordinary usage still more marked. In Latin the usage is more common. Asser, a Welshman, naturally speaks of "Saxones," and his so speaking is a strong proof of the genuineness of his work. Florence Worcester therefore, in that part of his Chronicle in which he copies Asser, retains Asser's language, and speaks of "Saxones" whereas, when speaking in his own words or translating from the Chronicles, he speaks of "Angli" from the beginning. I doubt the subjects of Ælfred, the books, poems, &c. to which the name "Saxon" is thus applied, were strictly Saxon; but a West-Saxon, speaking in his own tongue, would have called them so. Ælfred calls his own tongue "English" and nothing else; but Asser naturally called it "Saxon." So Bæda, as long as he draws at all from Welsh sources or repeats Welsh traditions, uses the words "Angli" and "Saxones" almost indiscriminately (Hist. Eccl. i. 14, 15, 22), but, as soon as he begins to speak fairly in his own person, he always uses "Angli" (i. 23 et seqq.). Exactly the same distinction will be found in the use of the words by Æthelweard and Henry of Huntingdon, who constantly use the word "Saxones" in what we may call the Welsh stage of their histories. In the like manner, Æddi or Eddius, the biographer of Wilfrith (c. 19, 20), speaking of the relations between Picts and Northumbrians, uses the Pictish mode of speech; he speaks of "Saxones," and says that the Picts "subjectionem Saxonum despiciebant." It is even not uncommon in the West-Saxon charters of his age to find "Saxonicè" used as a definition of language, where undoubtedly the vernacular definition would have been "on Englisc." Bæda not uncommonly (iii. 7 et al.) uses "Saxon" as a description of language, but it is usually, if not always, when he is speaking of persons or places which are strictly Saxon. He may therefore mean "Saxon" as opposed to "Anglian." But the usage certainly now and then passes these bounds, and we find the word Saxon and its derivatives applied to objects which were not strictly Saxon. Thus in a charter of Ecgrith of Mercia in 796 (Cod. Dipl. i. 207), we find the words "celebri vico qui Saxonicè vocatur æt Baðum." Though even here it is worth remarking that the place spoken

of, though at that time under Mercian rule, was in a district strictly Saxon. It is more remarkable when in a charter of Archbishop Wulfred in 825 (Cod. Dipl. i. 280), the Synod of Clovesho is said to be "*de diversis Saxoniae partibus congregatum.*" As the document chiefly relates to Mercian affairs, it is clear that "Saxonia" here means England generally. The word is used in the same sense at an earlier time in a letter of Wilfrith (Eddius, c. 29), in which he describes himself as "*episcopus Saxoniae.*" So again in the letter—whether genuine or not, matters little—of Eleutherius of Winchester in William of Malmesbury (i. 30), he is described as "*pontificatus Saxoniae gubernacula regens.*" In this passage "Saxonia" might mean Wessex, but Hwætberht, Abbot of Wearmouth (Bæda, Hist. Abb. Wiremuth, c. 14. p. 329. Hussey), also calls himself "*Abbas Cœnobii beatissimi apostolorum principis in Saxoniâ.*" It should of course be remembered that these are letters addressed to foreigners, and in which a foreign mode of speech is naturally adopted. Still, when I have these examples before me, and when I remember how late it was before the names "Anglia" and "Englaland" became thoroughly established in use, I am not clear whether the name "Saxonia" may not be the older of the two. It is quite possible that it might be so. The part of Britain occupied by the Teutonic invaders, the English land as distinguished from the English people, would receive its first territorial name from the Celts of the island, and that name would naturally be, as we have seen in the case of Lothian, "Saxonia." In communicating with foreigners, even Englishmen might, in the days of Wilfrith or Hwætberht, use the only territorial name which their country had as yet acquired, and, in the days of Wulfred, the same word might be occasionally used as a rhetorical flourish. I am therefore inclined to think that there is really more authority for calling England "Saxony" than for calling Englishmen "Saxons." Still, whatever may have been the case in earlier times, all these usages had died out long before the time of the Norman Conquest. After all England and all Britain had been brought into subjection to a Saxon dynasty, we hear no more about "Saxons" or "Saxony." The latest instance that I can remember of "Saxonicè" being used for "on Englisc" is in a passage of Florence of Worcester, which I have mentioned else-

where (p. 334). During the period of the Conquest, as the people are always "Angli" and their land "Anglia," so it is always the English language (*lingua Anglica* or *Anglicana*), never the Saxon, which contemporary writers oppose to the French.

The fact that the word "Saxon" is thus occasionally used in Latin, in cases where we always find "English" used in the native tongue, is, I think, mainly to be attributed to the tendency, one which has more or less influence on almost all Latin writings, to use expressions which sounded in any way grander or more archaic than those which were in common use. I suspect that the occasional use of "Saxon" instead of "English" was very much of a piece with the use, not uncommon in the charters, of "Albion" to express Britain. To talk of "Saxonia," "Saxonice," &c. was doubtless one of the elegancies of the *Kanzleistyl* of those days. It is an archaism, just as when, in a charter of Eadwig (Cod. Dipl. iii. 324. cf. 391), we read of the "Gewissi," a name which had passed out of use ages before. Once or twice we find "Teutonicè" instead of either "Anglicè" or "Saxonice." The decrees of the Synod of Cealcyth in 787 (Labbe and Cossart, vi. 1873) were published "tam Latinè quam *Teutonicè*, quo omnes intelligere possent." So in the *Encomium Emmæ* (p. 22) we once find the word used where either English or Danish is intended, and the expression is an unusual and affected one as applied to either. Still, in the great mass of instances, the use of the word "Saxon," though no doubt affected and archaistic, is still accurate. The cases are rare where we find it used out of the strictly Saxon districts, while "Anglus" and its derivatives are freely used out of the strictly Anglian districts. The title of "Rex Saxonum," common in the age of Ælfred, was the most accurate which he could assume. "Rex West-Saxonum;" he was less than "Rex Anglorum." His immediate dominion took in nearly all the Saxon part of Eng-land and but little beyond the Saxon title. Still it appears Saxons" was therefore a very appropriate title. and his vernacular laws he is only "King of the West-Saxons." (See above, p. 54.) and Cod. Dipl. ii. 114.)

The name "Anglo-Saxon," though rare, is a genuine and ancient description of the nation. I have already quoted two

vernacular examples of its use. It is also used occasionally in Latin, as by Asser (M. H. B. 483), by Florence of Worcester (A. 1066), by Simeon of Durham (X Scriptt. 137). In the Latin charters, especially those of Eadwig, it is not uncommon. In one place an expression something like it is put into a Norman mouth. Orderic (666 A) makes certain Normans say, "Saxones Anglos prostravimus." This is evidently a mere flourish, like his calling the Byzantine Empire "Ionia" and its inhabitants "Danai" and "Pelasgi." The passage reminds one of William of Poitiers' comment, where, after describing the valour of the English at Senlac, he adds, "Gens equidem illa semper in ferrum prompta fuit, descendens ab antiquâ Saxonum origine ferocissimorum hominum." But he never calls the English of his own time "Saxons."

"Anglo-Saxon" then, unlike "Saxon," is a description which is justified by ancient authority. But it is quite clear that it is a description which never passed into common use. The name by which our forefathers really knew themselves was "English" and no other. "Angli," "Engle," "Angel-cyn," "Englisc," are the true names by which the Teutons of Britain knew themselves and their language. The people are the English, their tongue is the English tongue, their King is the King of the English. The instances of any other use are to be found in a foreign language, and are easily accounted for by exceptional causes. And even these exceptional usages had quite died away before the period of our history with which we are immediately concerned. The people whom William overcame at Senlac, and over whom he was crowned King at Westminster, knew themselves, and were known to their conquerors and to all the rest of the world except the Celts of Britain and Ireland, by the name of ENGLISH and by the name of ENGLISH alone.

But it is sometimes argued that, though our forefathers confessedly called themselves English, yet we ought, in speaking of them, to call them something else; that, though Ælfred called his own tongue English, we ought to correct him and call it Saxon. Now the presumption is surely in favour of calling any people by the name by which they called themselves, especially when that name has gone on in uninterrupted use to our own days. Our national nomenclature has not changed for

a thousand years. In the days of Ælfred, as now, the Englishman speaking in his own tongue called himself an Englishman. In the days of Ælfred, as now, his Celtic neighbour called him a Saxon. As we do not now speak of ourselves by the name by which Welshmen and Highlanders speak of us, some very strong reason indeed ought to be brought to show that we ought to speak of our forefathers, not as they spoke of themselves, but as Welshmen and Highlanders spoke of them. But the reason commonly given springs out of mere misconception and leads to further misconceptions. From some inscrutable cause, people fancy that the word English cannot be rightly applied to the nation, its language, or its institutions, till after the Norman element has been absorbed into it; that is, in truth, that nothing can be called English, till it has become somewhat less English than it was at an earlier time. The tongue which Ælfred, in the days of its purity, called English, we must not venture to call English till the days when it had received a considerable infusion of French. This notion springs from a completely wrong conception of the history of our nation. The refusal to call ourselves and our forefathers a thousand years back by the same name originates in a failure to realize the fact that our nation is the same nation as that which migrated from Germany to Britain in the fifth century. In the words of Sir Francis Palgrave, "I must needs here pause, and substitute henceforward the true and ancient word English for the unhistorical and conventional term Anglo-Saxon, an expression conveying a most false idea of our civil history. *It disguises the continuity of affairs, and substitutes the appearance of a new formation in the place of a progressive evolution*" (Normandy and England, iii. 596). People talk of the "English" as a new nation which arose, in the thirteenth century perhaps, as a mixed race of which the "Saxons" or "Anglo-Saxons" were only one element among several. Now in a certain sense, we undoubtedly are a mixed race, but not in the sense in which popular language implies. We are a mixed race in the sense of being a people whose predominant blood and speech has incorporated and assimilated with itself more than one foreign infusion. But we are not what our High-Dutch kinsmen call a *Mischvolk*, a mere *colluvies gentium*, a mere jumble of races in which no one element is predominant.

People run over the succession of the various occupants of Britain—Romans, Britons, Saxons, Danes, Normans—sometimes as if they were races each of which ate up the one before it, sometimes as if they were, each in the same sense, component elements of the modern English nation. The correct statement of the case is much clearer and simpler. A Low-Dutch people, which adopted as its national name the name of one of its tribes, namely the Angles, settled in Britain in the fifth and sixth centuries. It has occupied the greater part of Britain ever since. It has ever since uninterruptedly retained its national being, its national language, its national name. But it has at different times assimilated several foreign elements. The conquered Welsh were, as far as might be, extirpated or driven out, but a small Welsh infusion into our language, and therefore no doubt a small Welsh infusion into our blood, is owing to the fact that the women were largely spared. A small Welsh element was thus assimilated. The Danish element, far greater in extent than the Welsh, hardly needed assimilation; the ethnical difference between the Englishman and the Dane was hardly greater than the ethnical difference between one tribe of Englishmen and another. Lastly, came the Norman, or rather French, element, which was also gradually assimilated, but not till it had contributed a most important infusion, though still only an infusion, into our institutions and our language. Setting aside the kindred Danes, we have thus assimilated two utterly foreign elements, British and French, what our forefathers called *Bret-Welsh* and *Gal-Welsh*. But these elements are not coequal with the original substance of the nation. In all these cases, the foreign element was simply incorporated and assimilated into the existing Low-Dutch stock. The small Welsh element, the large Danish and French elements, were absorbed in the predominant English mass. The Briton and the Norman gradually became Englishmen. The kindred Dane of course became an Englishman with far greater ease. All adopted the English name; all adopted, while to some extent modifying, the English tongue. If we confine the name "English" to the men, the speech, the laws, of the time after the last assimilation had become complete, if we talk of "Saxons" as only one coequal element among others, we completely misrepresent the true

history of our nation and language. Such a way of speaking cuts us off from our connexion with our forefathers ; it wipes out the fact that we are the people who came to this island fourteen hundred years back, and not another people. We have absorbed some very important elements from various quarters, but our true substance is still the same. We are like a Roman *gens*, some of whose members, by virtue of the law of adoption, are not Fabii or Cornelii by actual blood, but which nevertheless is still essentially the Fabian or Cornelian *gens*. If we allow ourselves to use, as people constantly do, the words "Saxon" or "Anglo-Saxon" as chronological terms, we altogether wipe out the fact of the continuous existence of our nation. People talk of "Saxons" and "Anglo-Saxons" as of races past and gone. Sometimes, especially in architectural disquisitions, they seem to fancy that all "the Saxons" lived at one time, forgetting that Harold is removed from Hengest by as many years as Charles the First is removed from Harold. A man, a word, a book, a building, earlier than 1066 is called "Saxon;" whether the same man, word, book, or building, after 1066 is "Norman," I have never been able to find out. Waltheof, born before 1066, was of course a "Saxon;" what were the children whom he begot and the buildings which he built after 1066? This chronological use of the word "Saxon" implies one of two alternatives; either the "Saxons" were exterminated by the Normans, or else the "Saxons" turned into Normans. People talk of "the Saxon Period" and "the Norman Period," as if they followed one another like the periods of geology, or like Hesiod's races of men. The "Norman Period" is a phrase which may be admitted to express a period when Norman influences were politically predominant. We may speak of the Norman period, as we may speak of the Angevin period or the Hannoverian period. But, if we are to talk of a "Saxon period" at all, it is a period which began in 449 and which has not ended in 1866.

The most grotesque instance of this confused sort of nomenclature is to be found in the technical language of unscientific philologists. The gradual result of the Norman Conquest on the English language was twofold. The English language, like other languages, especially other Low-Dutch languages, was, at the time of the Conquest, already beginning to lose, in

popular speech at least, the fulness and purity of its ancient inflexions. This process the Norman Conquest hastened and rendered more complete. It also introduced a great number of foreign words into the language, many of which supplanted native words. The result of these two processes is that the English of a thousand years back, like the Norse or the High-Dutch of a thousand years back, is now unintelligible except to those who specially study it. But the English language has never either changed its name or lost its continuity. In the eyes of the scientific philologist, it is the same English language throughout all its modifications. But by unscientific philologists, the language, from some utterly mysterious cause, is not called English until the two processes of which I speak are accomplished. Before those processes begin, it is "Saxon" or "Anglo-Saxon;" while they are going on, it is "*Semi-Saxon*"—a name perhaps the most absurd to be found in the nomenclature of any human study. It is manifest that, with such a nomenclature as this, the true history of the English language and its relation to other Teutonic languages never can be understood.

One word as to the name "Anglo-Saxon." I have shown that it is a real ancient name, used, though very rarely, in English documents, and somewhat more commonly in Latin ones. But it was always a mere formal description; it never became the familiar name of the nation. The meaning of the word also is commonly completely misconceived. In modern use "Anglo-" is a prefix used very liberally, and certainly used in more than one meaning. We have heard of "Anglo-Saxons," "Anglo-Normans," "Anglo-Americans," "Anglo-Indians," "Anglo-Catholics." I cannot presume to guess at the meaning of the prefix in the last formation; but I conceive "Anglo-Normans" to mean Normans settled in England, and "Anglo-Americans" to mean Englishmen settled in America. By "Anglo-Saxons," I conceive, in the vulgar use of the word, is meant Saxons who settled in England (meaning of course in Britain), as opposed to the Old-Saxons who stayed in Germany. It is as when Henry of Huntingdon (M. H. B. 708 C) inaccurately talks of an "adventus Saxonum in Angliam," while the accurate Bæda (Hist. Eccl. i. 33) talks of the "adventus Anglorum in Brittaniam." But this is not the meaning of the word "Anglo-Saxon" as used by Asser, Florence, and King

Æthelstan himself. "King of the Anglo-Saxons," as a title of Æthelstan or Eadred, meant simply "King of the Angles and Saxons," a way of describing him which was clearly more correct, though far less usual, than the common style of "Rex Anglorum." That this latter style, under a purely Saxon dynasty, became regular and universal, that "Rex Saxonum" died completely out, that "Rex Anglo-Saxonum" was always comparatively rare, is the most overwhelming proof that "English" was the real and only recognized name of the united nation. "Anglo-Saxon" then, in certain positions, is a perfectly correct description. But its modern use is dangerous, because it is so extremely liable to misconstruction. Again, its correct use is so very narrow that the term becomes almost useless. It is quite correct to call Æthelstan "King of the Anglo-Saxons," but to call this or that subject of Æthelstan "an Anglo-Saxon" is simply nonsense. As a *chronological* term "Anglo-Saxon" is equally objectionable with "Saxon." The "Anglo-Saxon period," so far as there ever was one, is going on still.

I speak therefore of our forefathers, not as "Saxons" or even as "Anglo-Saxons," but as they spoke of themselves, as Englishmen—"Angli," "Engle," "Angel-cyn." I call their language, not "Saxon" or even "Anglo-Saxon," but, as Ælfred called it, "English." I thus at once adhere to the custom of the time of which I speak, and I also avoid the misconception and confusion which are inherent in any other way of speaking. But the different forms which names have assumed in later times, allow us to make an useful distinction between the two uses of the same word. In Latin it was necessary to use the single word "Anglus" to express both the whole nation and one particular part of it. But we can now speak of the whole nation as "English," while we can speak of the tribe from which the nation borrowed its name as "Anglian." When I wish pointedly to distinguish the men, the language, or the institutions of the time before 1066 from those of any time after 1066, I speak distinctively of "Old-English," as our kinsmen speak of "Alt-Deutsch."

I now leave the subject with the golden words of Sir Francis Palgrave (England and Normandy, iii. 630-2);

"The gradual formation of our present English as contradistinguished from what is usually termed Anglo-Saxon, is a

problem not to be solved by one single cause of the Norman accession : for though that event accelerated the change, still we must be permitted to repeat what we conceive to be the guiding principle of our historical investigations—that the Conquest only accelerated a process which otherwise would have proceeded more slowly and more incompletely : but still, that it would have differed only in degree, and not in kind. And here again we must take the test of comparison, as supporting the assertion which we have made. We regret the loss of our 'English undefiled.' In grim despair the philologist pores over the strains of Beowulf, and, failing to solve the impenetrable enigmas of the lay, he weeps over the deleterious influence of the Conquest. But has the Gothic speech fared better in its own country ? Shall we find, in essentials, very much more conformity to antiquity in Scandinavia ? Alas ! if Regner Lodbrok were to chaunt his death-song in the streets of Copenhagen, nay, even of Drontheim, the Quida would be as little intelligible to his auditors, as if Cædmon, accompanying himself upon his harp, were to intonate his glee at an oratorio in Hanover Square.

"Our readers will recollect that, in conformity with our denial of the real existence of an Anglo-Saxon nation, except as a convenient, though somewhat delusive mode of designating the English of the ante-Norman period, so also must we deny there being any Anglo-Saxon language. If you had asked Alfred what he had in his hand, he would have answered it was an *Engliscboc*, and have been wonderfully surprised if you had given it any other name. The distinction then between the language which, in compliance with inveterate habit, we will call Anglo-Saxon, and the English, anterior to the Reformation,—for that event had here as well as in Germany great influence upon language,—consists, first, in the adoption of foreign words, principally from the Romance dialect of France ; and secondly, in the obliteration of many of the inflexions of Anglo-Saxon grammar, the loss of all the cases save one, the diminution of the nice distinction in the moods of verbs by means of the tones and semitones of the vowels, and the general simplification in the construction of the phrases."

NOTE B. pp. 67, 497.

THE CESSION OF LOTHIAN.

I HAD reserved the question as to the date of the cession of Lothian to the Scottish Kings on account of the apparent contradiction between the dates assigned to the transaction by the only ancient writers who record it. After the greater part of the present volume was printed, I became acquainted with the work of Mr. E. W. Robertson, "Scotland under the Early Kings," and I have been able to introduce some references to it while correcting the proofs of my last Chapter. The book is one which, though I hold many of its views to be erroneous, cannot be passed by without notice. It is a work of evident research and ability, and Mr. Robertson has the advantage of an acquaintance with Celtic literature to which I can make no pretensions. And if I were inclined to reproach Mr. Robertson for writing with an obvious Scottish bias, he would probably be able to retort with equal truth that I write with an obvious English bias. Perfect impartiality on the subjects in dispute between Mr. Robertson and myself is not likely to be found in any Englishman or in any Scotsman, perhaps not in any man of either Teutonic or Celtic blood. But I am glad to find that Mr. Robertson agrees with me in looking on all such controversies as purely historical, and I find with especial pleasure that, on several points where our theories do not clash, Mr. Robertson and myself have come independently to the same conclusions.

My narrative of the relations between England and Scotland, and my view of the dependence of the Scottish Crown on the English Empire from 924 to 1328, are grounded on what I believe to be the sure witness of ancient authorities, read to a great extent under the guidance of Sir Francis Palgrave. All notion of any legal or permanent dependence such as I assert is cast aside by Mr. Robertson. I confess that, after reading Mr. Robertson's arguments, I remain of the same opinion as I did before. He has thrown a certain amount of doubt on a few

details which are not absolutely essential, but I think that he has utterly failed to upset those clear passages of the *Chronicles* on which the belief which I share with Sir Francis Palgrave mainly rests. Unluckily the scheme of my work, especially at this stage of it, does not allow me to grapple in detail with Mr. Robertson's arguments as to the earliest stages of the question. But I confess that I feel strongly inclined to enter minutely into them in some other shape. The subject is one excellently suited for a monograph, and if I do not find any opportunity for a single combat with Mr. Robertson, I trust that some other champion of the rights of Eadward and Æthelstan may be forthcoming.

I will here enter on one point only besides the immediate subject of this note, namely the Cession of Lothian. This is the Commendation of Scotland to Eadward in 924, the most important point in the whole dispute. The choosing of Eadward as Father and Lord by the King of Scots and the whole people of the Scots is, both in the thirteenth and in the nineteenth century, the primary fact from which the English controversialist starts. William of Malmesbury, or even Florence of Worcester, may have blundered or exaggerated about Eadgar's triumph at Chester or about any other point of detail, but, as long as the fact of the great Commendation is admitted, the case of the West-Saxon Emperors of Britain stands firm. That Commendation is recorded, as clearly as words can make it, not in a ballad or in a Saga, not in the inflated rhetoric of a Latin charter, but in the honest English of the Winchester Chronicle. If we are not to believe a fact on such evidence as this, there is nothing in those times which we can believe. It is strange that, in the obvious place for treating of the subject, in the text of his history at vol. i. p. 59, Mr. Robertson has not a word to say about the matter, but passes over the year 924 as if it were bare of events. But in an Appendix (vol. ii. p. 394) he discusses the matter at some length. To the truth of the famous record which I have quoted at pp. 60, 129 of my own text Mr. Robertson makes several objections.

First, he alleges that the Northumbrian Danes did not submit to Eadward. It is almost enough to answer that this passage is

evidence that they did. If we are not to accept the distinct statements of the Chronicles, we are altogether at sea in the history of these times. Mr. Robertson's reason for doubting the truth of the statement is that it is inconsistent with certain passages in other English writers—he might have added in the Chronicles themselves—which attribute the first annexation of Northumberland to Æthelstan in 926. But there is nothing irreconcilable in the two statements. I gave the explanation in my own text without having heard of Mr. Robertson's objections; "Eadward's immediate Kingdom reached to the Humber, and his over-lordship extended over the whole island" (p. 60). But, from 926 onwards, the object of Æthelstan and his successors was to extend, not their over-lordship but their immediate sovereignty, over the whole of Northumberland. "Æthelstan cuning feng to Norðhymbra rice." He became the immediate King of the country, whereas Eadward had been only Father and Lord to its King and people. After 926 Northumbrian Kings were often set up, but, except the Lords of Bamborough, no Northumbrian Prince was admitted by Æthelstan to vassalage. He asserted and maintained an immediate dominion over the country. This system was followed by his successors, except during the momentary recognition of Olaf and Rægnald by Eadmund in 943. There is therefore no contradiction. Eadward introduced one state of things in Northumberland and Æthelstan introduced another.

Secondly, Mr. Robertson objects that the Chronicles represent the Commendation to have been made at Bakewell in the Peakland, and that this is inconsistent "with the words which Simeon and Florence place in the mouth of Malcolm Ceanmore" in 1092 (it should be 1093), which "show that, in the opinion of that age, no Scottish king had ever met an Anglo-Saxon sovereign except upon their *mutual* [sic] frontiers." Now, if there were any real inconsistency between the two statements, the direct statement of the Chronicle under the year 924 is surely much better authority for the events of the year 924 than an inference made by Mr. Robertson from a speech attributed to Malcolm in 1093. If Malcolm's speech contradicts the facts of history, so much the worse for Malcolm and his speech. But there is really no inconsistency at all. The Chronicle in no

way implies that the Commendation was made at Bakewell, and Malcolm in no way implies that it was not made at Bakewell. The Chronicler puts the Commendation of the King of Scots and the other princes in the same year as the building of the fortress of Bakewell, but he does not say that they came to Bakewell to make the Commendation. Malcolm says only that the Kings of Scots had been used to "do their duty" (*rectitudinem facere*) to the Kings of the English only on the confines of their dominions. The assertion may be true or false, but it is quite another thing from asserting that no King of Scots had ever met an English King anywhere but on the frontier. The first place of meeting need not have been the same as that which was usual 169 years later. I am not even clear that the Commendation implies any personal meeting between the Kings. But if there was such a meeting, there is nothing to shew whether it was at Bakewell or anywhere else.

Lastly, Mr. Robertson objects that Rægnald or Regenwald, who is described as one of the princes who submitted in 924, died in 921. I presume that, along with the Commendation of Rægnald in 924, Mr. Robertson sets aside his taking of York, which the Chronicles place in 923. This is asking us to give up a good deal out of deference to his Irish guides. But here again there is no necessary inconsistency. Mr. Robertson refers to the Annals of Ulster. Those Annals (*Ant. Celt. Norm.* p. 66) undoubtedly kill "Reginald O'Ivar," not in 921, but in 920; but the name was a common one, and I see no evidence that the two Rægnalds need be the same. The Annals of Ulster themselves show that there was another person of the same name, "Reginald Mac Beolach," living in the same part of the world in 917. I will not rely on the signatures of two Charters of 930 by Regenwald and Reinwald (*Cod. Dipl.* ii. 167-171), because Mr. Kemble marks them as doubtful. Anyhow I see here no proof of error in our Chronicles. There is no real contradiction between the English and Irish authorities, and, if there were, I really do not see why the Englishman should necessarily go to the wall. But granting that Rægnald's name was wrongly inserted, such a mistake would not touch the main fact of the Commendation. Such a fact as the Commendation of Scotland and Strathclyde is a thing about which there could be no mis-

take. It is either an historical truth or a barefaced lie. But, in mentioning several minor princes who commended themselves at the same time, a wrong name might easily slip in without any evil intention. Several Northumbrian chiefs commended themselves; Rægnald was a famous Northumbrian name; a scribe might easily put Rægnald instead of some other name. The blunder would not be so bad as when Thietmar calls Ælfheah Dunstan (see above, p. 384), or as the utter confusion which the Scandinavian writers make of the names and order both of English Kings and of Norman Dukes.

I have examined this question in full, because it is the root of the whole matter. Other questions raised by Mr. Robertson I must pass by, or reserve for some other opportunity for discussion. I hope that, from this specimen, he will see that I am quite ready to do battle with him. I certainly think that the Commendation of 924 is in no way touched by Mr. Robertson's objections, and I feel sure, from the acuteness which Mr. Robertson displays in other parts of his work, that he would never have satisfied himself with such futile arguments except under the influence of strong national partiality.

I now go on to the proper subject of this note, the Cession of Lothian. Was the cession of that part of Northumberland to the Scottish Crown a grant from Eadgar to his faithful vassal Kenneth? Or was the district extorted by Malcolm from the fears of Eadwulf Cutel, or won by force of arms after the battle of Carham in 1018?

The Chronicles, Florence, William of Malmesbury, Simeon of Durham in his main history, are all silent as to any transfer of Lothian from English to Scottish dominion. And yet nothing is more certain than that Lothian was at one time English and that at a later time it became Scottish. The only question is as to the date of the change. The first beginnings of the Scottish occupation of Lothian are certainly older than either of the dates given above. Indulf, who reigned from 954 to 962, occupied Edinburgh, Eadwinesburh, the frontier fortress of the great Northumbrian Bretwalda, which ever after remained in the power of the Scots. This does not seem to have been a conquest made in war. The English forsook the post. "In hujus tempore," says the Pictish

Chronicler (*Ant. Celt. Norm.* p. 142), "*oppidum Eden vacuatum est, ac relictum est Scottis usque in hodiernum diem.*" Possibly Edinburgh was a grant made by Eadred on his final acquisition of Northumberland in 954. Eadred's relations with Scotland were friendly. The Scots made full submission to him on his election in 946; they acted as his allies in his wars with the rebellious Northumbrians; Scots and English, "the men of Alba and the Saxons," were, according to the Four Masters (vol. ii. p. 668), defeated by the "foreigners"—doubtless the Danes—in 951. If Eadred rewarded his Scottish ally with the grant of Edinburgh, the step would be very like the grant of Cumberland to Malcolm in 945. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the relinquishment of Edinburgh by the English may have been somewhat less completely an act of free will; it may have been found difficult or useless to maintain so distant a fortress during the troubles of the reign of Eadwig. But, on any showing, the event of Indulf's reign was simply a relinquishment of the single fortress of Edinburgh, though such a relinquishment may well have been felt, especially on the Scottish side, to be merely a step towards the transfer of the whole province. For the date of the great cession our authorities are John of Wallingford (p. 544) and Roger of Wendover (i. 416), who give the earlier date, and Simeon of Durham in his Tract on the Northumbrian Earls (*X Scriptt.* 81) who gives the later.

According to John of Wallingford, Eadgar (see above, p. 292), in a meeting of the Northumbrian Witan at York (*Barones Northumbrenses in concilium convocans apud Eboracum*), divided the ancient Kingdom into two Earldoms, giving Deira to Oslac and Bernicia (which he confusedly calls Deira) to Eadwulf "Evelchild." The name of Eadwulf is seemingly due to some confusion with Oswulf, whom John fancies to be dead. But Lothian, the northern part of Bernicia, lying exposed to the incursions of the Scots, was little valued by the English Kings. Kenneth also asserted a claim to it by hereditary right. He went to London, accompanied by the two Northumbrian Earls and by Ælfsige Bishop of Lindisfarne, to seek a conference with Eadgar. Eadgar received him friendly, and Kenneth opened his case, praying for Lothian as an ancient possession of the Scottish Kings. Eadgar refers the matter to his Witan (*causam curiæ suæ intimavit*), by whose

consent the province **was** granted in fief—I cannot terms of a later jurisprudence—to Kenneth, who did it. Kenneth also promised that the ancient laws and of the country should be preserved and the English retained, an engagement which was strictly carried *cautione multâ promittens quod populo partis illius consuetudines non negaret, et sub nomine et linguâ remanerent. Quod usque hodie firmum manet*). Thus dispute about Lothian was settled, though new ones oft (*sicque determinata est vetus querela de Louthion, et adh nova intentatur*).

Roger of Wendover is briefer. He tells how Earl Ead he does not mention Oslac—and Bishop Ælfsige to Scottish King to the court of Eadgar; how the King English gave Kenneth many magnificent presents, and gave him the whole land of Lothian. The tenure was that, each on the great feasts when the King wore his crown (see Peterborough Chronicle under the year 1087), the King of should come to his court with the other princes of his re Eadgar also assigned to his royal vassal and his successors several mansions at different points of the road, at which could be entertained on their way to the English court, with mansions the Kings of Scots retained down to the time Henry the Second.

Simeon places the cession after the death of Uhtred in 10 (see above, pp. 416, 496).

“Quo [Uctredo] occiso, frater ipsius Eadulf cognomen Cudel, ignavus valdè et timidus, ei successit in comitatu Timens autem ne Scotti mortem suorum quos frater ejus, ut supradictum est [see above, p. 358], occiderat, in se vindicarent totum Lodoneium ob satisfactionem et firmam concordiam eorum donavit. Hoc modo Lodoneium adjectum est regno Scottorum.”

Now, looking at our authorities in the abstract, there is no doubt as to the infinite superiority of Simeon, our very best authority for Northumbrian affairs, over two late, and often inaccurate, writers like John of Wallingford and Roger of Wendover. If there is an irreconcilable contradiction between the two stories, Simeon's story is to be preferred without hesi-

tation. I hold that Simeon's statement distinctly proves that there was a cession of Lothian made by Eadwulf, and, if so, we can hardly be wrong in setting down that cession as a result of the battle of Carham. The question is whether this can be admitted, and at the same time some kernel of truth be recognized in the story told by John and Roger. Let us first see what the witness of those writers is worth in itself.

I need hardly say that secondary writers of this sort, even the best of them, must be subjected to much severer tests than the Chronicles, than Florence, even than William of Malmesbury. We accept nothing, strictly speaking, on their *authority*. We weigh their statements and judge what they are worth, both according to the laws of internal evidence, and according to the way in which they may incidentally fall in with or incidentally contradict the statements of better writers. We put very little faith in their details, which are more likely than not to be romantic additions. Still in all cases we recognize the probability that there is some kernel of truth round which the romantic details have grown. John of Wallingford is undoubtedly a writer whom it is not safe to trust, unless his statements have some strong confirmation, internal or external. Of his way of dealing with matters, I have given some specimens in the course of this volume (see above, pp. 344, 483). Still he is not to be cast aside as wholly reprobate. A few pages before the passage with which we are concerned (p. 540), he shows a good deal of critical acumen in pointing out the chronological impossibility of the tale which makes Rolf an ally of the great Æthelstan (see above, p. 188). Roger of Wendover is, on the whole, a more trustworthy writer than John, and, when he comes near to his own time, he becomes a very valuable authority; but, for times so far removed from their own days, John and Roger must be set down as writers belonging essentially to the same class. Now in comparing their two statements as to the cession of Lothian by Eadgar, we are at once struck by the fact that the two accounts seem quite independent of each other. There is no sign that either narrative is borrowed from the other, none that the two are borrowed from some common source. The two stories do not directly contradict one another, but they have nothing in common,

APPENDIX.

the bare facts that Kenneth received the province from and that Earl Eadwulf and Bishop Ælfsige had a hand in the business. They are two independent witnesses, pointing to me, to two independent sources of tradition or record. And of the two, the narrative of John of Wallingford certainly has the clearer inherent signs of trustworthiness: there is any ground to suspect fabrication with a motive—necessarily in the historian himself, but in those whom he follows—it certainly appears in the narrative of Roger rather than that of John. Roger gives no account of the circumstances of the grant, he assigns no intelligible political motive, he describes no intelligible tenure by which the fief was held; he dwells mainly on the magnificence of the present made by Eadgar to Kenneth, and on points bearing on the peace and negotiation. The point brought out into the most prominent place is the duty of the King of Scots to attend the English court, and the signs at once of English munificence and of Scottish submission displayed in the preparation for the due reception of the royal vassal. These were points of small interest in the times when Roger was young, and were not forgotten when he wrote (see above, p. 144).

John of Wallingford. He has undoubtedly made a false step on ground which it is very easy to make a false step, namely in the narrative of the Northumbrian Earls. Even the accuracy of writing so much nearer to the place and to the time, in one case at least, done the like (see above, p. 49), Eadwulf Egelchild ought to be Oswulf, just as Simeon ought to be Eadwulf. But John's main story fits well with the facts of the case. Mr. Robertson (ii. 391) tells us that there was no "old quarrel about Lothian."

But John's main story fits well with the facts of the case. Mr. Robertson (ii. 391) tells us that there was no "old quarrel about Lothian."

But John's main story fits well with the facts of the case. Mr. Robertson (ii. 391) tells us that there was no "old quarrel about Lothian."

But John's main story fits well with the facts of the case. Mr. Robertson (ii. 391) tells us that there was no "old quarrel about Lothian."

But John's main story fits well with the facts of the case. Mr. Robertson (ii. 391) tells us that there was no "old quarrel about Lothian."

But John's main story fits well with the facts of the case. Mr. Robertson (ii. 391) tells us that there was no "old quarrel about Lothian."

Scottish Kings were now looking steadily in the direction of Lothian. Kenneth himself, friendly as he now was to Eadgar, had been guilty of at least one foray into the country. The Pictish Chronicle (Ant. Celt. Norm. 143) says, "*Primo anno perrexit Cinadius et prædavit Saxoniam et traduxit filium Regis Saxonum.*" The captivity of an English Ætheling is a grotesque exaggeration, but we may accept the fact that Kenneth had some border skirmishes with the local Earl, who, in 971, the first year of Kenneth, would be Oswulf. I ought therefore perhaps to modify some of the expressions which I have once or twice used in the text as to the perfect peacefulness of Eadgar's relations with the Scots, though a single foray of this kind does not seriously disturb the general statement any more than the trifling wars on the Welsh border (see p. 66). The Scots then had been seriously looking towards Lothian for some time. Now that Eadgar and Kenneth were on friendly terms, a grant of the country, like the undoubted grant of Cumberland, like the probable grant of Edinburgh, might be an act of thoroughly good policy. A distant province, which it was hard to retain as an integral part of the Kingdom, might be prudently granted as a fief to the prince by whom it was claimed, and to whose incursions it lay open. That the conditions mentioned by John of Wallingford, the retention of the laws and language of Lothian, were strictly observed, is proved by the whole later history. The laws and language of Lothian became the laws and language of the historic Scotland.

The cession then recorded by John of Wallingford seems therefore to be in itself highly probable. But is it inconsistent with the later, and undoubtedly better authenticated, cession recorded by Simeon of Durham? It does not seem to me to be so, neither did it to Sir Francis Palgrave (Engl. Comm. i. 474, 477) or to Dr. Lappenberg (ii. 141, 207, p. 472 of the original). It may be that Lothian, a somewhat vague word, has a slightly different meaning in the two passages; it may be that a cession was made to Kenneth by Eadgar, and a further cession by Eadwulf Cutel to Malcolm. It is less easy to believe, with Sir Francis Palgrave, that Eadwulf's cession was a cession of the rights of the local Earl, reserved, or not formally surrendered, at the time of the earlier grant by the King. The simplest explanation is to suppose that Lothian was recovered by the

APPENDIX.

er the great victory of Uhtred in 1006, that it was again by the Scots after their victory at Carham, the cowardly Eadwulf relinquished all claim to the throne. In that year at least, "Scotta cyng him wearð his mann"—Malcolm then became the liege King of all England for Scotland and Lothian and had.

believe to be the most probable explanation of this question. The silence of the Chronicles proves nothing; it has to be accounted for equally on either view. No transfer of Lothian at any time is mentioned in the Chronicles, yet we know that a transfer did take place at the time of the reign of Edgar. The positive argument from the statement is always the strongest that can be found in every degree of strength or weakness. Here it seems to be accounted for. The Chroniclers are at all times somewhat negligent in their mention or neglect of Scottish affairs. They mention neither the victory of Durham nor the defeat of Carham during the reigns of Eadgar and Cnut, the periods with which the Chronicles are, on the whole, decidedly meagre, as compared with the minute narratives of the reigns of Æthelred and of the Confessor.

NOTE C. P. 145.

USE OF IMPERIAL TITLES BY THE ENGLISH KINGS. Here give some examples of the various titles assumed by the Kings from Æthelstan to Cnut. Three remarkable cases are already quoted in pp. 145, 148, 164. I now add some which either illustrate the use of the Latin Imperial titles or which are remarkable on some other ground. I refrain from quoting those which present nothing beyond the use of the word *Basileus*, which is almost as common as the word *Imperator*.

as *Rex*. Those which are found in charters marked by Mr. Kemble with an asterisk I mark with an asterisk also.

1. Ego Æðelstanus Rex Anglorum per omnipatrantis dexteram totius Britanniæ regni solio sublimatus. Cod. Dipl. ii. 159. cf. v. 193.

*2. Quinto anno ex quo nobilissimè gloriosus Rex Anglo-saxones regaliter gubernabat, tertioque postquam authenticè Northanhumbrorum Cumbrorumque blandâ mirifici conditoris benevolentia patrocinando sceptrinæ gubernaculum perceperat virgæ. ii. 160.

Ego Æpelstan Rex et rector totius Britannia cæterarumque Deo concedente gubernator provinciarum. ii. 161. cf. v. 215.

*3. Ego Æðelstanus ipsius [altitonantis sc.] munificentia Basileus Anglorum simul et *Imperator Regum* et nationum infra fines Britanniæ commorantium. ii. 164.

*4. Ego Æðelstanus divinæ dispensationis providentiâ tam super Britannicæ gentis quam super aliarum nationum huic subditarum *imperium* elevatus Rex. ii. 167.

5. Ego Æðelstanus florentis Brytanniæ *monarchia* præditus Rex. ii. 173.

6. Ego Æðelstanus Rex *monarchus* totius Bryttanniæ insulæ, flante Domino. ii. 204.

7. Ego Æpelstanus divinâ mihi adridente gratiâ Rex Anglorum et *Curagulus* totius Bryttanniæ. ii. 215.

8. Ego Æðelstanus Angulsaxonum Rex non modicâ infulatûs sublimatus dignitate. v. 187.

9. Ego Æðelstanus, omnicreantis disponente clementiâ Angli-genarum omniumque gentium undique secus habitantium Rex. v. 214.

10. Ego Æðelstan, Christo conferente Rex et primicerius totius Albionis, regni fastigium humili præsidens animo. v. 201, 204.

11. Ego Æðelstanus . . . favente superno numine Basileus industrius Anglorum cunctarumque gentium in circuitu persistentium. v. 229.

*12. Ego Eadmundus divinâ favente gratiâ Basyleos Anglorum cæterarumque provinciarum in circuitu persistentium primatum regalis regiminis obtinens. ii. 220.

1. The Imperial style of Queen Elizabeth, "Our King and Queen, our Emperor and Empress," which I was obliged to quote from memory in p. 164, comes from a speech made by Archbishop Heath in 1559, which will be found in Strype's Annals, I. Append. No. 6. The exact words are, "She being our Sovereign Lord and Lady, our King and Queen, our Emperor and Empress, other Kings and Princes of duty ought to pay tribute unto her, she being free from them all." A pamphlet was published in 1706, when the Union with Scotland was under debate, headed, "The Queen an Empress, and her three Kingdoms an Empire," proposing a curious scheme for a British Empire, with subordinate Kings, Princes, and a Patriarch of London. It is of course an imitation of the constitution of *the* Empire, but the writer refers once or twice to the days of Eadgar for precedents.

2. The influence of Charles the Great in English affairs (see pp. 39, 40) is singularly exaggerated in a passage of John of Wallingford, p. 529. "*Rex Pipinus obiit regni ejus anno xii. Successitque Karolus filius anno ab Incarnatione Domini DCCLXIX. Porro iste, sicut alia regna, sic et Angliam tempore hujus Regis Offæ sibi subegit.*" But there is a remarkable testimony to the impression made on the minds of Englishmen by Charles' dealings in the matters of Eardwulf, Ealhwine, and Archbishop Janberht (see Palgrave, Eng. Comm. i. 486), in the account of the relations between Cenwulf of Mercia and Archbishop Wulfred, Cod. Dipl. i. 281. "*Tunc in eodem concilio cum maximâ districtione illi episcopo mandavit quod omnibus rebus quæ illius dominationis sunt dispoliatus debuisset fieri, omnique de patriâ istâ esse profugus, et numquam nec verbis domni Papæ nec Cæsaris seu alterius alicujus gradu huc in patriam iterum recipisse.*" Cenwulf clearly held that the Bishop of Rome, and the Emperor of Rome too, had no jurisdiction in his realm of Mercia.

3. Of the rare use of the word "Basileus" any where but in charters (see p. 424), there is another example in the Ramsey History, p. 445. The writer speaks of "*Ædgari victoriosissimi Anglorum basilei munificentia regalis.*"

4. The "*alterius orbis Apostolicus*" of Eadmer (see p. 146) is almost paralleled by an expression in William of Jumièges, vi. 9

29. Ego Eadwig *imperiali* Anglo-Saxonum diademate infu-
latus. v. 379.

30. Ego Eadwig Rex Saxonum. v. 395.

31. Ego Eadgar Britanniae Anglorum *monarchus*. ii. 374.

*32. Ego Eadgarus Anglorum Basileus, omniumque Regum
insularum oceani quæ Britanniam circumjacent, cunctarumque
nationum quæ infra eum includuntur *Imperator* et dominus . . .
monarchiam totius Angliæ . . . Anglorum *imperio* . . . Ego Eadgar
Basileus Anglorum et Imperator regum gentium. ii. 404-6.
See above, p. 66.

33. Ic Eádgár cyning éac þurh his [Godes] gife ofer Engla
þeóde nú úp áræred, and he hæfð nú gewýld tó mínum anwealde
Scottas and Cumbras and éac swylce Bryttas and eal ðæt ðis
igland him on innan hæfd. iii. 59.

34. Ego Eadgar divinâ allubescence gratiâ totius Albionis
Imperator Augustus. iii. 64.

*35. Signum Eadgari et serenissimi Anglorum *Imperatoris*.
iii. 109.

36. Ego Eadgar gratiâ Dei Rex Merciorum cæterarumque
circumquaque nationum. vi. 3.

37. Ego Eadgarus gentis Anglorum et barbarorum atque
gentilium Rex et prædux. vi. 69.

*38. Ego Æðelred Dei gratiâ Anglorum Rex *imperiosus*.
iii. 204.

*39. Ego Æðelredus famosus totius Brittannicæ insulæ *Im-*
perator. iii. 251.

40. Ego Æðelredus totius Albionis Dei providentiâ *Impera-*
tor. iii. 290.

41. Ego Æþelred rex totius insulæ. Ego Æþelred rex et rector
angul sexna. iii. 316, 317.

42. Ego Æðelred gentis gubernator Angligenæ totiusque in-
sulæ coregulus Britannicæ et cæterarum insularum in circuitu
adjacentium. iii. 323.

43. Ego Æðelredus ipsius [celsitonantis Dei] opitulante
gratiâ Brittaniarum Rex. iii. 337.

*44. Ego Æðelredus Anglorum *Induperator*. See above, p.
164.

Ic Æðelred mid Godes gyfe Angelþeóde cyning and weald-
end éac óðra iglanda ðe hér ábútan licgað. iii. 348.

- *45. Ego Æðelredus totius Britanniae *Induperator*. iii. 355.
 46. Prædicta *Augusta* [Ælfifu-Emma]. iii. 358.
 *47. Æðelred Rex Anglo-Saxoniae atque Norðhymbrensis gubernator *monarchiae*, paganorumque propugnator, ac Bretonum cæterarumque provinciarum *Imperator*. vi. 166.
 48. Æðelredus, gratiâ Dei sublimatus Rex et *monarchus* totius Albionis. vi. 167.
 49. Ego Cnut totius Britanniae *monarchus*. vi. 179.
 50. Ego *Imperator* Knuto, à Christo Rege Regum regiminis Anglici in insulâ potitus. iv. 1.
 51. Ego Cnut telluris Britanniae totius largifluâ Dei gratiâ subpetente subthronizatus Rex et rector. iv. 7.
 *52. Ic Cnut þurh Godes geve Ænglelandes kining and ealre ðære eglande ðe ðærtó licgeð. iv. 23.
 53. Ego Cnut Rex totius Albionis cæterarumque gentium triviatim persistentium Basileus. iv. 35.
 54. Ego Cnut, misericordiâ Dei Basileus, omnis Britanniae regimen adeptus. iv. 45.

Of these forms, Nos. 9, 11, 12 are used over and over again with various slight changes. The forms "totius Britanniae" or "Albionis Rex" or "Basileus" occur constantly. They are distinctly more common than the simple "Anglorum Rex." "Anglorum Basileus" and forms to the like effect are also common. In fact a charter which does not in one way or the other assert a dominion beyond the simple royalty of the English nation is rather the exception. On the other hand we now and then, as in Nos. 19, 30, come upon forms which are startling from their very simplicity. No. 30, I suppose, belongs to the days when Eadwig was reduced to the Kingdom of Wessex. Meanwhile Eadgar in his Mercian charter, No. 36, seems to claim, what doubtless was the case, the external dominion of the Crown as belonging to himself rather than to his West-Saxon brother. Nos. 13, 14, 15, 17, 25, 47 are remarkable for the use of the word "Angli" and "Angulseaxe" in a sense excluding Northumberland. In No. 13 indeed "Angli" excludes the Mercians. It might be almost rendered "Saxons." So completely had "Anglus" become the national name, even in the most purely Saxon parts of the country.

The titles *Primicerius* and *Curagulus* or *Coregulus* are very strange; both are common. Probably *Curagulus* means *caretaker*, but with the idea of *Rex* or *Regulus* floating in the mind of the scribe, which accounts for the spelling *Coregulus*. I am uncertain whether the words *monarchus*, *monarchia*, are to be reckoned as strictly Imperial. They are so used by Dante in his famous treatise “*De Monarchiâ* ;” but it is clear that they have no such special meaning in the rhetoric of Dudo, and they may have been used with equal vagueness in the kindred rhetoric of our charters.

It is worth noticing that, though some of the most distinctly Imperial descriptions are found in charters whose genuineness is undoubted, yet the proportion of them which are found in doubtful or spurious charters is remarkably large. This circumstance in no way tells against the Imperial theory, but rather in its favour. A forger will naturally reproduce whatever he thinks most characteristic of the class of documents which he is imitating; but, in so doing, he will probably somewhat overdo matters. A forger, thus attempting to copy the style of a charter of Eadgar or Æthelred, perhaps actually reproducing a genuine charter from memory, would naturally fill his composition with the most high-sounding of all the titles that he had ever seen in any genuine charter. The most purely Imperial style would thus find its way into forgeries in greater abundance than into genuine charters. Still the spurious documents are, in this way, evidence just as much as the genuine ones; they continue the tradition of the genuine ones. It is not often that a forger blunders so palpably as the author of No. 47, with his “*Rex Anglo-Saxoniz*,” a form apparently unique, and which surely can never have been really used. The doubtful and spurious charters have therefore a certain value; their formulæ are part of the case, and I have not scrupled to add them to my list.

I may here, for want of a better place, mention one or two points connected with Imperial matters, and also bring in one or two other remarks bearing on subjects treated of in my text and notes, which have occurred to me while turning over the charters for the purposes of the above list.

1. The Imperial style of Queen Elizabeth, "Our King and Queen, our Emperor and Empress," which I was obliged to quote from memory in p. 164, comes from a speech made by Archbishop Heath in 1559, which will be found in Strype's *Annals*, I. Append. No. 6. The exact words are, "She being our Sovereign Lord and Lady, our King and Queen, our Emperor and Empress, other Kings and Princes of duty ought to pay tribute unto her, she being free from them all." A pamphlet was published in 1706, when the Union with Scotland was under debate, headed, "The Queen an Empress, and her three Kingdoms an Empire," proposing a curious scheme for a British Empire, with subordinate Kings, Princes, and a Patriarch of London. It is of course an imitation of the constitution of *the* Empire, but the writer refers once or twice to the days of Eadgar for precedents.

2. The influence of Charles the Great in English affairs (see pp. 39, 40) is singularly exaggerated in a passage of John of Wallingford, p. 529. "Rex Pipinus obiit regni ejus anno xii. Successitque Karolus filius anno ab Incarnatione Domini DCCLXIX. Porro iste, sicut alia regna, sic et Angliam tempore hujus Regis Offæ sibi subegit." But there is a remarkable testimony to the impression made on the minds of Englishmen by Charles' dealings in the matters of Eardwulf, Ealhwine, and Archbishop Janberht (see Palgrave, *Eng. Comm.* i. 486), in the account of the relations between Cenwulf of Mercia and Archbishop Wulfred, *Cod. Dipl.* i. 281. "Tunc in eodem concilio cum maximâ districtione illi episcopo mandavit quod omnibus rebus quæ illius dominationis sunt dispoliatus debuisset fieri, omnique de patriâ istâ esse profugus, et numquam nec verbis domni Papæ *nec Caesaris* seu alterius alicujus gradu hac in patriam iterum recipisse." Cenwulf clearly held that the Bishop of Rome, and the Emperor of Rome too, had no jurisdiction in his realm of Mercia.

3. Of the rare use of the word "Basileus" any where but in charters (see p. 424), there is another example in the Ramsey History, p. 445. The writer speaks of "Ædgari victoriosissimi Anglorum basilei munificentia regalis."

4. The "alterius orbis Apostolicus" of Eadmer (see p. 146) is almost paralleled by an expression in William of Jumièges, vi. 9

(p. 263), where Lanfranc is called "*Gentium transmarinarum summus Pontifex*." It will be remembered that the English King is sometimes called "*Rex transmarinus*" (Flodoard, anno 945).

5. Besides the will of Wulfric (p. 379), the confirmation charter of his foundation at Burton, granted by King Æthelred and his Witan in 1004, is given in Cod. Dipl. iii. 330. This is the year of the first exploit of Ulfcytel (see p. 352), who signs the Charter. It is pleasant to find the two heroes thus acting together. The charter is also signed by Æthelric and Morkare, probably Wulfric's legatees of those names.

6. The elder Northman (see p. 457), with the rank of Thegn, receives a grant of lands from Æthelred and his Witan in 988. Cod. Dipl. iii. 234. He is also mentioned in the doubtful charter of 1013, the one where we find the title of *Rex Anglo-Saxoniae*. Cod. Dipl. vi. 166.

7. With regard to the baptism of Cnut (pp. 412, 484), the ancient scholiast on Adam of Bremen (ii. 50) says, "*Knut filius Svein Regis abjecto nomine gentilitatis, in baptismo Lambertus nomen accepit*." Like his father and like Rolf, he retained his heathen name in common use.

NOTE D. p. 231.

THE DEATH OF WILLIAM LONGSWORD.

OUR accounts of the circumstances which led to the death of William Longsword differ singularly from each other. Flodoard simply tells us that Arnulf invited him to a conference, and there caused him to be put to death. "*Anno DCCCXLIII. Arnulfus Comes Willelmum Nortmannorum Principem ad colloquium evocatum dolo perimi fecit*." Thus much we may accept as certain, but the oldest French and Norman versions of the events immediately going before are remarkably unlike, and in later writers we find quite another version of the whole affair.

Richer (ii. 30 et seqq.) connects the murder of William with an insult offered by him to King Otto in the Council held by Otto and Lewis at Attigny. William, whether by accident or by design, was not admitted at the beginning of the meeting.

1. The Imperial style of Queen Elizabeth, "Our King and Queen, our Emperor and Empress," which I was obliged to quote from memory in p. 164, comes from a speech made by Archbishop Heath in 1559, which will be found in Strype's Annals, I. Append. No. 6. The exact words are, "She being our Sovereign Lord and Lady, our King and Queen, our Emperor and Empress, other Kings and Princes of duty ought to pay tribute unto her, she being free from them all." A pamphlet was published in 1706, when the Union with Scotland was under debate, headed, "The Queen an Empress, and her three Kingdoms an Empire," proposing a curious scheme for a British Empire, with subordinate Kings, Princes, and a Patriarch of London. It is of course an imitation of the constitution of *the* Empire, but the writer refers once or twice to the days of Eadgar for precedents.

2. The influence of Charles the Great in English affairs (see pp. 39, 40) is singularly exaggerated in a passage of John of Wallingford, p. 529. "*Rex Pipinus obiit regni ejus anno xii. Successitque Karolus filius anno ab Incarnatione Domini DCCLXIX. Porro iste, sicut alia regna, sic et Angliam tempore hujus Regis Offæ sibi subegit.*" But there is a remarkable testimony to the impression made on the minds of Englishmen by Charles' dealings in the matters of Eardwulf, Ealhwine, and Archbishop Janberht (see Palgrave, Eng. Comm. i. 486), in the account of the relations between Cenwulf of Mercia and Archbishop Wulfred, Cod. Dipl. i. 281. "*Tunc in eodem concilio cum maximâ districtione illi episcopo mandavit quod omnibus rebus quæ illius dominationis sunt dispoliatus debuisset fieri, omnique de patriâ istâ esse profugus, et numquam nec verbis domni Papæ nec Cæsaris seu alterius alicujus gradu huc in patriam iterum recipisse.*" Cenwulf clearly held that the Bishop of Rome, and the Emperor of Rome too, had no jurisdiction in his realm of Mercia.

3. Of the rare use of the word "*Basileus*" any where but in charters (see p. 424), there is another example in the Ramsey History, p. 445. The writer speaks of "*Anglorum basilei munificentia regalis.*"

4. The "*alterius orbis Apostolicus*" of Eadmer (see p. 146) is almost paralleled by an expression in William of Jumièges, vi. 9

(p. 263), where Lanfranc is called "*Gentium transmarinarum summus Pontifex*." It will be remembered that the English King is sometimes called "*Rex transmarinus*" (Flodoard, anno 945).

5. Besides the will of Wulfric (p. 379), the confirmation charter of his foundation at Burton, granted by King Æthelred and his Witan in 1004, is given in Cod. Dipl. iii. 330. This is the year of the first exploit of Ulfcytel (see p. 352), who signs the Charter. It is pleasant to find the two heroes thus acting together. The charter is also signed by Æthelric and Morkare, probably Wulfric's legatees of those names.

6. The elder Northman (see p. 457), with the rank of Thegn, receives a grant of lands from Æthelred and his Witan in 988. Cod. Dipl. iii. 234. He is also mentioned in the doubtful charter of 1013, the one where we find the title of *Rex Anglo-Saxoniae*. Cod. Dipl. vi. 166.

7. With regard to the baptism of Cnut (pp. 412, 484), the ancient scholiast on Adam of Bremen (ii. 50) says, "*Knut filius Svein Regis abjecto nomine gentilitatis, in baptismo Lambertus nomen accepit*." Like his father and like Rolf, he retained his heathen name in common use.

NOTE D. p. 231.

THE DEATH OF WILLIAM LONGSWORD.

OUR accounts of the circumstances which led to the death of William Longsword differ singularly from each other. Flodoard simply tells us that Arnulf invited him to a conference, and there caused him to be put to death. "*Anno DCCCXLIII. Arnulfus Comes Willelmum Nortmannorum Principem ad colloquium evocatum dolo perimi fecit*." Thus much we may accept as certain, but the oldest French and Norman versions of the events immediately going before are remarkably unlike, and in later writers we find quite another version of the whole affair.

Richer (ii. 30 et seqq.) connects the murder of William with an insult offered by him to King Otto in the Council held by Otto and Lewis at Attigny. William, whether by accident or by design, was not admitted at the beginning of the meeting.

1. The Imperial style of Queen Elizabeth, "Our King and Queen, our Emperor and Empress," which I was obliged to quote from memory in p. 164, comes from a speech made by Archbishop Heath in 1559, which will be found in Strype's Annals, I. Append. No. 6. The exact words are, "She being our Sovereign Lord and Lady, our King and Queen, our Emperor and Empress, other Kings and Princes of duty ought to pay tribute unto her, she being free from them all." A pamphlet was published in 1706, when the Union with Scotland was under debate, headed, "The Queen an Empress, and her three Kingdoms an Empire," proposing a curious scheme for a British Empire, with subordinate Kings, Princes, and a Patriarch of London. It is of course an imitation of the constitution of *the* Empire, but the writer refers once or twice to the days of Eadgar for precedents.

2. The influence of Charles the Great in English affairs (see pp. 39, 40) is singularly exaggerated in a passage of John of Wallingford, p. 529. "*Rex Pipinus obiit regni ejus anno xii. Successitque Karolus filius anno ab Incarnatione Domini DCCLXIX. Porro iste, sicut alia regna, sic et Angliam tempore hujus Regis Offæ sibi subegit.*" But there is a remarkable testimony to the impression made on the minds of Englishmen by Charles' dealings in the matters of Eardwulf, Ealhwine, and Archbishop Janberht (see Palgrave, Eng. Comm. i. 486), in Archbishop Wulfred, Cod. Dipl. i. 281. "*Tunc in eodem concilio cum maximâ districtione illi episcopo mandavit quod fieri, omnique de patriâ istâ esse depoliatus debuisset verbis domni Papæ nec Cæsaris seu alterius alicujus gradu huc in patriam iterum recipisse.*" Cenwulf clearly held that the Bishop of Rome, and the Emperor of Rome too, had no jurisdiction in his realm of Mercia.

3. Of the rare use of the word "*Basileus*" any where but in charters (see p. 424), there is another example in the Ramsey Anglorum basilei munificentia regalis." "*Ædgari victoriosissimi*

4. The "*alterius orbis Apostolicus*" of Eadmer (see p. 146) is almost paralleled by an expression in William of Jumièges, vi. 9

(p. 263), where Lanfranc is called "*Gentium transmarinarum summus Pontifex*." It will be remembered that the English King is sometimes called "*Rex transmarinus*" (Flodoard, anno 945).

5. Besides the will of Wulfric (p. 379), the confirmation charter of his foundation at Burton, granted by King Æthelred and his Witan in 1004, is given in Cod. Dipl. iii. 330. This is the year of the first exploit of Ulfcytel (see p. 352), who signs the Charter. It is pleasant to find the two heroes thus acting together. The charter is also signed by Æthelric and Morkare, probably Wulfric's legatees of those names.

6. The elder Northman (see p. 457), with the rank of Thegn, receives a grant of lands from Æthelred and his Witan in 988. Cod. Dipl. iii. 234. He is also mentioned in the doubtful charter of 1013, the one where we find the title of *Rex Anglo-Saxoniae*. Cod. Dipl. vi. 166.

7. With regard to the baptism of Cnut (pp. 412, 484), the ancient scholiast on Adam of Bremen (ii. 50) says, "*Knut filius Svein Regis abjecto nomine gentilitatis, in baptismo Lambertus nomen accepit*." Like his father and like Rolf, he retained his heathen name in common use.

NOTE D. p. 231.

THE DEATH OF WILLIAM LONGSWORD.

OUR accounts of the circumstances which led to the death of William Longsword differ singularly from each other. Flodoard simply tells us that Arnulf invited him to a conference, and there caused him to be put to death. "*Anno DCCCXLIII. Arnulfus Comes Willelmum Nortmannorum Principem ad colloquium evocatum dolo perimi fecit*." Thus much we may accept as certain, but the oldest French and Norman versions of the events immediately going before are remarkably unlike, and in later writers we find quite another version of the whole affair.

Richer (ii. 30 et seqq.) connects the murder of William with an insult offered by him to King Otto in the Council held by Otto and Lewis at Attigny. William, whether by accident or by design, was not admitted at the beginning of the meeting.

After waiting for some time, he forced his way in in great wrath, and his indignation was further heightened at what he then saw. The two Kings were sitting on a raised couch, the Eastern King, the truer successor of Charles, taking the seat of honour. Below them, on two chairs, sat Hugh the Great and Arnulf. William had lately renewed his homage to Lewis, and was filled with zeal for the honour of his over-lord. He bade Lewis rise, and he himself took his seat immediately below Otto. It was not fit that the Western King should allow any man to sit above him (*Ipse resedit, dixitque indecens esse Regem inferiorem, alium verò quemlibet superiorem videri*). He then made Otto rise, and made Lewis take the seat vacated by Otto, he himself keeping the place immediately below Lewis, that where Lewis himself had been seated at first (*Quapropter oportere Ottonem inde amoliri, Regique cedere. Otto pudore affectus surgit ac Regi cedit. Rex itaque superior, at Wilhelmus inferior consederunt*). William thus proclaimed his theory of precedence; the King of the West-Franks first, the Duke of the Normans second, the Teutonic King and the French princes seemingly nowhere. Such a doctrine was naturally unacceptable alike to Otto, Hugh, and Arnulf. They dissembled their anger at the time, but when the Council had broken up, and when Lewis and William had gone away together, they met and discussed their wrongs privately. Otto, in vague terms, exhorted Hugh and Arnulf to vengeance against William; he who had not spared him, King Otto, would certainly not spare them (*Qui sibi Regi non indulgit, minùs illis indulturum*). Richer however does not charge Otto with counselling the assassination of William, unless such a charge is implied in the words (c. 31), "*conceptum facinus variis verborum coloribus obvelat*." Hugh and Arnulf then met together and determined on the murder of William. His death was expedient, because it would enable them to get Lewis completely into their power, whereas now William supported the King against them (*Regem etiam ad quodcumque volent faciliùs inflexuros, si is solum pereat, quo Rex fretus ad quæque flecti nequeat*). The plot was laid; Arnulf invited William to the conference at Picquigny; the Norman Duke was there killed by some of the conspirators whose names are not given, but not in the presence or by the avowed orders of the Count of Flanders.

Dudo's story (pp. 104 et seqq.) is quite different. He knows nothing of the Council of Attigny, nothing of King Otto as having even an involuntary share in William's murder. With him the first deviser of the scheme is Arnulf, to whom all mischief is as naturally attributed at this stage of Norman history, as it is, first to Ælfric and then to Eadric, at a later stage of English history. Arnulf's quarrel with William arises wholly out of the affair of Herlwin of Montreuil (see above, p. 227). But certain French Princes who are not named join with Arnulf in the conspiracy (*Arnulfus Dux Flandrensium suprà memoratus, veneno viperæ calliditatis nequiter repletus astuque diabolicæ fraudis exitialiter illectus, gentisque Franciscæ quorundam principum subdolo consilio et malignitate atrociter exhortatus, cœpit meditari et tractare lugubrem mortem ejus Willelmi*). From this point the two tales are nearly the same; only Dudo of course throws Arnulf's conversation with William into a characteristic Dudonian shape. Arnulf is not only ready to make up his differences with Herlwin; he asks for William's protection against King Lewis, Duke Hugh, and Count Herbert; he is ready to become William's tributary during life, and to make him his successor at his death (*Quamdiu superstes fuero ero tibi tributarius, meique servient tibi ut domino servus. Post meæ resolutionis excessum, possidebis meæ ditionis regnum*). No one but Dudo could have thought of putting such words into Arnulf's mouth, even by way of a blind. The actual assassination is described in much the same way as it is by Richer; but Dudo gives us the names of the actual murderers. They are Eric, Balzo, Robert, and Ridulf or Riulf.

Now these two versions, though at first sight so utterly different, do not formally contradict one another. It is quite possible that Arnulf may have been led to his crime by a combination of causes, of which Richer has enlarged on one part and Dudo on another, according to their several points of view. Arnulf may well have been incensed against William at once on account of the wrong done to him in the matter of Montreuil and also on account of the insult offered to him at Attigny. And in fact the two narratives to a certain degree incidentally coincide. Richer implies that Arnulf and his confederates were already incensed against William before the meeting at Attigny (*Quæ*

After waiting for some time, he forced his way in in great wrath, and his indignation was further heightened at what he then saw. The two Kings were sitting on a raised couch, the Eastern King, the truer successor of Charles, taking the seat of honour. Below them, on two chairs, sat Hugh the Great and Arnulf. William had lately renewed his homage to Lewis, and was filled with zeal for the honour of his over-lord. He bade Lewis rise, and he himself took his seat immediately below Otto. It was not fit that the Western King should allow any man to sit above him (*Ipse resedit, dixitque indecens esse Regem inferiorem, alium verò quemlibet superiorem videri*). He then made Otto rise, and made Lewis take the seat vacated by Otto, he himself keeping the place immediately below Lewis, that where Lewis himself had been seated at first (*Quapropter oportere Ottonem inde amoliri, Regique cedere*). Otto *pudore affectus surgit ac Regi cedit. Rex itaque superior, at Wilelmus inferior consederunt*). William thus proclaimed his theory of precedence; the King of the West-Franks first, the Duke of the Normans second, the Teutonic King and the French princes seemingly nowhere. Such a doctrine was naturally unacceptable alike to Otto, Hugh, and Arnulf. They dissembled their anger at the time, but when the Council had broken up, and Lewis and William had gone away together, they met and discussed their wrongs privately. Otto, in vague terms, exhorted Hugh and Arnulf to vengeance against William; he who had not spared him, King Otto, would certainly not spare them (*Qui sibi Regi non indulsit, minis illis indulturum*). Richer however does not charge Otto with counselling the assassination of William, unless such a charge is implied in the words (c. 31), "*coloribus obvelat*." Hugh and Arnulf then met together and determined on the murder of William. His death was expedient, because it would enable them to get Lewis completely into their power, whereas now William supported the King against them (*Regem etiam ad quodcumque volent facilius inflexuros, si is solum pereat, quo Rex fretus ad quæque flecti nequeat*). The plot was laid; Arnulf invited William to the conference at Picquigny; the Norman Duke was there killed by some of the conspirators whose names are not given, but not in the presence or by the avowed orders of the Count of Flanders.

Dudo's story (pp. 104 et seqq.) is quite different. He knows nothing of the Council of Attigny, nothing of King Otto as having even an involuntary share in William's murder. With him the first deviser of the scheme is Arnulf, to whom all mischief is as naturally attributed at this stage of Norman history, as it is, first to Ælfric and then to Eadric, at a later stage of English history. Arnulf's quarrel with William arises wholly out of the affair of Herlwin of Montreuil (see above, p. 227). But certain French Princes who are not named join with Arnulf in the conspiracy (*Arnulfus Dux Flandrensium suprà memoratus, veneno viperæ calliditatis nequiter repletus astuque diabolicæ fraudis exitialiter illectus, gentisque Franciscæ quorundam principum subdolo consilio et malignitate atrociter exhortatus, cœpit meditari et tractare lugubrem mortem ejus Willelmi*). From this point the two tales are nearly the same; only Dudo of course throws Arnulf's conversation with William into a characteristic Dudonian shape. Arnulf is not only ready to make up his differences with Herlwin; he asks for William's protection against King Lewis, Duke Hugh, and Count Herbert; he is ready to become William's tributary during life, and to make him his successor at his death (*Quamdiu superstes fuero ero tibi tributarius, meique servient tibi ut domino servus. Post meæ resolutionis excessum, possidebis meæ ditionis regnum*). No one but Dudo could have thought of putting such words into Arnulf's mouth, even by way of a blind. The actual assassination is described in much the same way as it is by Richer; but Dudo gives us the names of the actual murderers. They are Eric, Balzo, Robert, and Ridulf or Riulf.

Now these two versions, though at first sight so utterly different, do not formally contradict one another. It is quite possible that Arnulf may have been led to his crime by a combination of causes, of which Richer has enlarged on one part and Dudo on another, according to their several points of view. Arnulf may well have been incensed against William at once on account of the wrong done to him in the matter of Montreuil and also on account of the insult offered to him at Attigny. And in fact the two narratives to a certain degree incidentally coincide. Richer implies that Arnulf and his confederates were already incensed against William before the meeting at Attigny (*Quæ*

After waiting for some time, he forced his way in in great wrath, and his indignation was further heightened at what he then saw. The two Kings were sitting on a raised couch, the Eastern King, the truer successor of Charles, taking the seat of honour. Below them, on two chairs, sat Hugh the Great and Arnulf. William had lately renewed his homage to Lewis, and was filled with zeal for the honour of his over-lord. He bade Lewis rise, and he himself took his seat immediately below Otto. It was not fit that the Western King should allow any man to sit above him (*Ipse resedit, dixitque indecens esse Regem inferiorem, alium verò quemlibet superiorem videri*). He then made Otto rise, and made Lewis take the seat vacated by Otto, he himself keeping the place immediately below Lewis, that where Lewis himself had been seated at first (*Quapropter oportere Ottonem inter amoliri, Regique cedere*). Otto, at Wilhelms inferior consederat. Rex itaque superior, at Wilhelms inferior consederat. William thus proclaimed his theory of precedence; the King of the West-Franks first, the Duke of the Normans second, the Teutonic King and the French princes seemingly now third. Such a doctrine was naturally unacceptable alike to Otto, Hugh, and Arnulf. They dissembled their anger at the time, but when the Council had broken up, and when Lewis and William had gone away together, they met and discussed their wrongs privately. Otto, in vague terms, exhorted Hugh and Arnulf to vengeance against William; he who had not spared him, King Otto, would certainly not spare them (*Qui sibi Regi non indulsit, minime illis indulturum*). Richer however does not charge Otto with counselling the assassination of William, unless such a charge is implied in the words (c. 31), "*conceptum facinus variis verborum coloribus obvelat*." Hugh and Arnulf then met together and determined on the murder of William. His death was expedient, because it would enable them to get Lewis completely into their power, whereas now William supported the King against them (*Regem etiam ad quodcumque volent facilius inflectere*). The plot was laid; Arnulf invited William to the conference at Picquigny; the Norman Duke was there killed by some of the conspirators whose names are not given, but not in the presence or by the avowed orders of the Count of Flanders.

Dudo's story (pp. 104 et seqq.) is quite different. He knows nothing of the Council of Attigny, nothing of King Otto as having even an involuntary share in William's murder. With him the first deviser of the scheme is Arnulf, to whom all mischief is as naturally attributed at this stage of Norman history, as it is, first to Ælfric and then to Eadric, at a later stage of English history. Arnulf's quarrel with William arises wholly out of the affair of Herlwin of Montreuil (see above, p. 227). But certain French Princes who are not named join with Arnulf in the conspiracy (*Arnulfus Dux Flandrensium suprà memoratus, veneno viperæ calliditatis nequiter repletus astuque diabolicæ fraudis exitialiter illectus, gentisque Franciscæ quorundam principum subdolo consilio et malignitate atrociter exhortatus, cœpit meditari et tractare lugubrem mortem ejus Willelmi*). From this point the two tales are nearly the same; only Dudo of course throws Arnulf's conversation with William into a characteristic Dudonian shape. Arnulf is not only ready to make up his differences with Herlwin; he asks for William's protection against King Lewis, Duke Hugh, and Count Herbert; he is ready to become William's tributary during life, and to make him his successor at his death (*Quamdiu superstes fuero ero tibi tributarius, meique servient tibi ut domino servus. Post meæ resolutionis excessum, possidebis meæ ditionis regnum*). No one but Dudo could have thought of putting such words into Arnulf's mouth, even by way of a blind. The actual assassination is described in much the same way as it is by Richer; but Dudo gives us the names of the actual murderers. They are Eric, Balzo, Robert, and Ridulf or Riulf.

Now these two versions, though at first sight so utterly different, do not formally contradict one another. It is quite possible that Arnulf may have been led to his crime by a combination of causes, of which Richer has enlarged on one part and Dudo on another, according to their several points of view. Arnulf may well have been incensed against William at once on account of the wrong done to him in the matter of Montreuil and also on account of the insult offered to him at Attigny. And in fact the two narratives to a certain degree incidentally coincide. Richer implies that Arnulf and his confederates were already incensed against William before the meeting at Attigny (*Quæ*

After waiting for some time, he forced his way in in great wrath, and his indignation was further heightened at what he then saw. The two Kings were sitting on a raised couch, the Eastern King, the truer successor of Charles, taking the seat of honour. Below them, on two chairs, sat Hugh the Great and Arnulf. William had lately renewed his homage to Lewis, and was filled with zeal for the honour of his over-lord. He bade Lewis rise, and he himself took his seat immediately below Otto. It was not fit that the Western King should allow any man to sit above him (*Ipse resedit, dixitque indecens esse Regem inferiorem, alium verò quemlibet superiorem videri*). He then made Otto rise, and made Lewis take the seat vacated by Otto, he himself keeping the place immediately below Lewis, that where Lewis himself had been seated at first (*Quapropter oportere Ottonem inde amoliri, Regique cedere. Otto pudore affectus surgit ac Regi cedit. Rex itaque superior, at Wilelmus inferior consederunt*). William thus proclaimed his theory of precedence; the King of the West-Franks first, the Duke of the Normans second, the Teutonic King and the French princes seemingly nowhere. Such a doctrine was naturally unacceptable alike to Otto, Hugh, and Arnulf. They dissembled their anger at the time, but when the Council had broken up, and when Lewis and William had gone away together, they met and discussed their wrongs privately. Otto, in vague terms, exhorted Hugh and Arnulf to vengeance against William; he who had not spared him, King Otto, would certainly not spare them (*Qui sibi Regi non indulsit, minùs illis indulturum*). Richer however does not charge Otto with counselling the assassination of William, unless such a charge is implied in the words (c. 31), "*conceptum facinus variis verborum coloribus obvelat*." Hugh and Arnulf then met together and determined on the murder of William. His death was expedient, because it would enable them to get Lewis completely into their power, whereas now William supported the King against them (*Regem etiam ad quodcumque volent faciliùs inflexuros, si is solum pereat, quo Rex fretus ad quæque flecti nequeat*). The plot was laid; Arnulf invited William to the conference at Picquigny; the Norman Duke was there killed by some of the conspirators whose names are not given, but not in the presence or by the avowed orders of the Count of Flanders.

Dudo's story (pp. 104 et seqq.) is quite different. He knows nothing of the Council of Attigny, nothing of King Otto as having even an involuntary share in William's murder. With him the first deviser of the scheme is Arnulf, to whom all mischiefs are as naturally attributed at this stage of Norman history, as it is, first to Ælfric and then to Eadric, at a later stage of English history. Arnulf's quarrel with William arises wholly out of the affair of Herlwin of Montreuil (see above, p. 227). But certain French Princes who are not named join with Arnulf in the conspiracy (*Arnulfus Dux Flandrensium suprâ memoratus, veneno viperæ calliditatis nequiter repletus astuque diabolicæ fraudis exitialiter illectus, gentisque Franciscæ quorundam principum subdolo consilio et malignitate atrociter exhortatus, coepit meditari et tractare lugubrem mortem ejus Willelmi*). From this point the two tales are nearly the same; only Dudo of course throws Arnulf's conversation with William into a characteristic Dudonian shape. Arnulf is not only ready to make up his differences with Herlwin; he asks for William's protection against King Lewis, Duke Hugh, and Count Herbert; he is ready to become William's tributary during life, and to make him his successor at his death (*Quamdiu superstes fuero ero tibi tributarius, meique servient tibi ut domino servus. Post meæ resolutionis excessum, possidebis meæ ditionis regnum*). No one but Dudo could have thought of putting such words into Arnulf's mouth, even by way of a blind. The actual assassination is described in much the same way as it is by Richer; but Dudo gives us the names of the actual murderers. They are Eric, Balzo, Robert, and Ridulf or Riulf.

Now these two versions, though at first sight so utterly different, do not formally contradict one another. It is quite possible that Arnulf may have been led to his crime by a combination of causes, of which Richer has enlarged on one part and Dudo on another, according to their several points of view. Arnulf may well have been incensed against William at once on account of the wrong done to him in the matter of Montreuil and also on account of the insult offered to him at Attigny. And in fact the two narratives to a certain degree incidentally coincide. Richer implies that Arnulf and his confederates were already incensed against William before the meeting at Attigny (*Quæ*

After waiting for some time, he forced his way in in great wrath and his indignation was further heightened at what he then saw. The two Kings were sitting on a raised couch, the Eastern King, the truer successor of Charles, taking the seat of honour. Below them, on two chairs, sat Hugh the Great and Arnulf. William had lately renewed his homage to Lewis, and was filled with zeal for the honour of his over-lord. He bade Lewis rise, and he himself took his seat immediately below Otto. It was not fit that the Western King should allow any man to sit above him (*Ipse resedit, dixitque indecens esse Regem inferiorem, alium verò quemlibet superiorem videri*). He then made Otto rise, and made Lewis take the seat vacated by Otto, he himself keeping the place immediately below Lewis, that where Lewis himself had been seated at first (*Quapropter oportere Ottonem inde amoliri, Regique cedere. Otto pudore affectus surgit ac Regi cedit. Rex itaque superior, at Wilhelmus inferior consederunt*). William thus proclaimed his theory of precedence; the King of the West-Franks first, the Duke of the Normans second, the Teutonic King and the French princes seemingly nowhere. Such a doctrine was naturally unacceptable alike to Otto, Hugh, and Arnulf. They dissembled their anger at the time, but when the Council had broken up, and when Lewis and William had gone away together, they met and discussed their wrongs privately. Otto, in vague terms, exhorted Hugh and Arnulf to vengeance against William; he who had not spared him, King Otto, would certainly not spare them (*Qui sibi Regi non indulsit, minùs illis indulturum*). Richer however does not charge Otto with counselling the assassination of William, unless such a charge is implied in the words (c. 31), "*conceptum facinus variis verborum coloribus obvelat*." Hugh and Arnulf then met together and determined on the murder of William. His death was expedient, because it would enable them to get Lewis completely into their power, whereas now William supported the King against them (*Regem etiam ad quodcumque volent faciliùs inflexuros, si is solum pereat, quo Rex fretus ad quæque flecti nequeat*). The plot was laid; Arnulf invited William to the conference at Picquigny; the Norman Duke was there killed by some of the conspirators whose names are not given, but not in the presence or by the avowed orders of the Count of Flanders.

Dudo's story (pp. 104 et seqq.) is quite different. He knows nothing of the Council of Attigny, nothing of King Otto as having even an involuntary share in William's murder. With him the first deviser of the scheme is Arnulf, to whom all mischief is as naturally attributed at this stage of Norman history, as it is, first to Ælfric and then to Eadric, at a later stage of English history. Arnulf's quarrel with William arises wholly out of the affair of Herlwin of Montreuil (see above, p. 227). But certain French Princes who are not named join with Arnulf in the conspiracy (*Arnulfus Dux Flandrensiū suprā memoratus, veneno viperæ calliditatis nequiter repletus astuque diabolicæ fraudis exitialiter illectus, gentisque Franciscæ quorundam principum subdolo consilio et malignitate atrociter exhortatus, cœpit meditari et tractare lugubrem mortem ejus Willelmi*). From this point the two tales are nearly the same; only Dudo of course throws Arnulf's conversation with William into a characteristic Dudonian shape. Arnulf is not only ready to make up his differences with Herlwin; he asks for William's protection against King Lewis, Duke Hugh, and Count Herbert; he is ready to become William's tributary during life, and to make him his successor at his death (*Quamdiu superstes fuero ero tibi tributarius, meique servient tibi ut domino servus. Post meæ resolutionis excessum, possidebis meæ ditionis regnum*). No one but Dudo could have thought of putting such words into Arnulf's mouth, even by way of a blind. The actual assassination is described in much the same way as it is by Richer; but Dudo gives us the names of the actual murderers. They are Eric, Balzo, Robert, and Ridulf or Riulf.

Now these two versions, though at first sight so utterly different, do not formally contradict one another. It is quite possible that Arnulf may have been led to his crime by a combination of causes, of which Richer has enlarged on one part and Dudo on another, according to their several points of view. Arnulf may well have been incensed against William at once on account of the wrong done to him in the matter of Montreuil and also on account of the insult offered to him at Attigny. And in fact the two narratives to a certain degree incidentally coincide. Richer implies that Arnulf and his confederates were already incensed against William before the meeting at Attigny (*Quæ*

oratio [Ottonis sc.] plurimam invidiam paravit, ac amicos in odium Wilelmi incitavit, quum et ipsi quamvis latenter ei admodum inviderent). Dudo, as we have seen, speaks of a conspiracy of Arnulf with other French princes. It was not at all unnatural that the affair of Attigny should be of primary importance in the eyes of Richer, and that the affair of Montreuil should be of primary importance in the eyes of Dudo. Attigny lay quite beyond the reach of ordinary Norman vision, and William's conduct there might not seem very meritorious in Norman eyes. It was certainly something to have put an open affront upon the Eastern King, but it was perhaps hardly becoming in the independent Lord of the Norman Monarchy (see p. 193) to show such ostentatious deference to the Western King. It is therefore quite possible to construct a very probable narrative, taking in the main statements both of Richer and of Dudo, but of course allowing for the rhetorical and exaggerated form into which both of them throw their details. This is very much what is done by Sir Francis Palgrave (*Normandy and England*, ii. 299 et seqq.), only in one or two places he gives the story a strange colouring of his own. I can find nothing about William being himself too late, either on purpose or by accident. The statement of Richer, as I read it, is simply that, whether by design or by accident, he was shut out of the council-chamber. Again, Sir Francis simply says that William "compelled King Otho to rise;" he has not a word about William's motive for so doing or about the exaggerated loyalty which he displayed to Lewis.

One can hardly doubt, on the authority of Flodoard and Richer, that William was really killed at Picquigny by the machinations of Arnulf. But there is quite another story, briefly alluded to by Sir Francis Palgrave in two places (pp. 298, 303), which transfers the scene of the murder from the Somme to the Seine. This version turns up in several shapes. We get it in Rudolf Glaber (iii. 9. p. 38), according to whom the chief criminal was Theobald of Chartres. Theobald the Tricker is the first to devise the plot, and he is also the actual murderer. In concert with Arnulf, William is invited by Theobald to a conference somewhere on the Seine. Rudolf is not clear whether the summons was sent in the name of the King of the French

or of the Duke of the French (*promittens se ex parte Regis Francorum seu Hugonis Magni, qui fuerat filius Roberti Regis, quem Otto Dux Saxonum, postea verò Imperator Romanorum, Sueessionis interfecit*); that is to say, Rudolf already failed to realize that there had been a time when the King of the French was quite a different person from the Lord of Paris and the Seine. The story of the murder then follows much as before, with the Seine for the Somme and Theobald for Arnulf; only Theobald kills William with his own hand.

In the Tours Chronicle (Duchesne, *Rer. Franc.* iii. 365), we find another version. "*Guillelmus filius Rollonis Ducis Normanniæ à Balzone Curto in medio Sequanæ occisus est, propter mortem Riulfi et filii sui Anchetilli.*" Now we had Balzo in Dudo's account as the name of one of William's murderers, but we had no account of the man or of his motives. He here appears as the avenger of Riulf, doubtless the Riulf who headed the revolt against William in 932 (see p. 214). We then however heard nothing of Riulf's death, the statement of Dudo (94) being that "*Riulfus fugiendo evanuit.*" But who is Anchetillus, Anquetil, Anscytel, a palpable Dane like our own Thurcytels and Ulfcytels? And why should Balzo avenge either Anscytel or Riulf? Here comes in the story of William of Malmesbury, which he first tells (ii. 145) as if he fully believed it, and then adds, as more trustworthy (*veraciores literæ dicunt*), an abridgement of Dudo's story. Anscytel (Oscytel) is the son of Riulf, a Norman chief who had somehow incurred William Longsword's displeasure, and who greatly troubled him with his revolts. But Anscytel is the faithful soldier of Duke William, and he carries his loyalty so far as to take his father prisoner and to hand him over to the Duke. He does however exact a promise that Riulf shall suffer no punishment worse than bonds. But, not long after, Anscytel is sent by Duke William to Pavia with a letter for a potentate described as the Duke of Italy, asking that the bearer may be put to death (*Comes Anschetillum in Papiam dirigit, epistolam de suâ ipsius nece ad Ducem Italiæ portantem*). This, I need hardly say, is a story as old as Bellerophontês (Il. vi. 168) and as modern as Godwine (see p. 467). The Duke of Italy of course abhors the crime, and, equally of course, is in dread of the power of his brother of Normandy. A thousand horse-

digladiari), sent Leo Bishop of Trier into England to make peace. A document then follows described as the "*legationis epistola*" of this Prelate, containing an account of his mission, and giving the terms of the peace between Æthelred and Richard and the names of the plenipotentiaries on both sides. The document is very strange in point of form, as it begins in the name of the Pope, while the latter part clearly gives the actual words of the treaty. Sir Francis Palgrave (iii. 106) objects to the genuineness of the letter that its style is unusual, if not unparalleled, which it certainly is. It runs thus ; "*Johannes quintus decimus, sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ Papa, omnibus fidelibus.*" Sir Francis does not mention another objection, namely that, neither in 991 nor in 1001 was the Archbishop of Trier named Leo. The reigning Archbishop in 991 was Eckebert ; before 1000 he had been succeeded by Ludolf. (*Gesta Treverorum* ap. Pertz, viii. 169-171.) But Sir Francis adds, "While we reject the convention in the shape now presented, we accept its import. The quarrel and the reconciliation are unquestionable verities." But the quarrel and reconciliation recorded by William of Malmesbury are a quarrel and reconciliation between Æthelred and Richard the Fearless in a definite year 991. They cannot be turned into a quarrel and reconciliation between Æthelred and Richard the Good nine years later. The apparently wrong name of the Papal legate is a difficulty either way, but it is not a very formidable one. Dr. Lappenberg (p. 442 of the original German) calls Leo "*Vice-bischof von Trier*," which Mr. Thorpe (ii. 154) translates simply "Bishop." Dr. Lappenberg gives no reference for his description of Leo ; but a fact in German history may be safely accepted on his authority, and the local history of Trier which I have just referred to contains a statement which curiously fits in with our story. Archbishop Eckebert (977-993), son of Theodoric, Count of Holland, was the son of an English mother, and he kept up a close connexion with England. It is therefore quite natural that either he or an officer of his church should enter with zeal into a scheme for the advantage of a country which Eckebert seems almost to have looked on as his own. The other names are accurately given. John the Fifteenth was Pope, and Æthelsige was Bishop of Sherborne, in 991. Both were dead in 1000. I think it follows that the

account in William of Malmesbury cannot possibly refer to a transaction with Richard the Good in 1000. The story is definitely fixed to the year 991.

Is then William of Malmesbury's account ground enough for accepting a quarrel between Æthelred and Richard the Fearless, and a reconciliation brought about by Pope John Fifteenth? On the whole, I think it is. The transaction would be a very strange one to invent, if nothing of the sort happened at all, and it is hard to see to what other transaction the account can refer. The story also, as it seems to me, fits in well with the circumstances of the times. The "*legationis epistola*" can hardly be genuine in its actual shape as a letter of the Pope's, but it seems to be made out of two genuine documents, a letter of Pope John and the text of the treaty. The unusual style might be simply the bungling attempt of a compiler to show which of all the Popes named John was meant. The treaty itself bears every sign of genuineness, and the names of the English plenipotentiaries—I cannot profess to verify those on the Norman side—are distinctly in its favour. A mere forger would not have inserted such names as those of Leofstan and Æthelnoth. He would either have put in names quite at a venture, or else have picked out the names of some famous Ealdormen of the time. There could be no temptation for a forger to pitch on Leofstan and Æthelnoth, real contemporary men, but men of no special celebrity.

The reader has still to determine whether, accepting this account of Æthelred's quarrel with the elder Richard, he will go on to admit a second quarrel with the younger Richard. The only question is whether the story in William of Jumièges is pure invention, or whether its manifestly exaggerated details contain some such kernel of truth as I have supposed in the text. It certainly seems to me that to set the whole down as a mere lie is attributing too much even to the Norman power of lying, which I certainly have no wish to underrate. The story, in its general outline, seems to fit in well with the position of things at the time, and even with the character of Æthelred. But, if we accept it as thus far true, we must suppose that William of Jumièges transposed the invasion of the Côtentin and the marriage of Emma. He places the latter event first. Now the

marriage would follow very naturally on the conclusion of peace, while the invasion would not be at all likely to follow the marriage. Sir Francis Palgrave silently transposes the two events in the same way that I have done. He also connects the invasion, as I have done, with the reception of Danish vessels in the Norman havens. If this was, as I suppose, a breach of the treaty of 991, the wrath of Æthelred becomes still more intelligible. In this view of the matter, looking at the entry in the Chronicles under the year 1000, we can hardly fail to fix the event in that year.

Dr. Lappenberg, whose note (p. 422) should be read in the original text, takes the opposite view to Sir Francis Palgrave. He accepts the account of the transaction in 991, but carries back the invasion of the Côtentin to that year. This is at least more probable than Sir Francis' version, and perhaps some readers may be inclined to accept it rather than my notion of two distinct disputes. But the narrative of William of Jumièges connects the invasion in a marked way with the marriage of Emma, though he has clearly confounded the order of events.

Roger of Wendover (i. 427) boldly carries back the marriage of Emma to some date earlier than 990, and makes the quarrel between Æthelred and her father arise out of his ill-treatment of her. He was misled by William of Malmesbury's characteristic contempt for chronological order.

NOTE F. p. 450.

THE ORIGIN OF EARL GODWINE.

THE prominent position of Godwine at the time of Cnut's death is one of the most conspicuous facts of our history, and the combined evidence of the charters and of the biographer of Eadward has enabled me to trace up his greatness to the earliest days of Cnut's reign. But, when we ask for the birth and parentage of the man who became the greatest of English subjects, who all but became the father of a new line of English Kings, we find ourselves involved in utter obscurity and contradiction. Was he the son of Child Wulfnoth the South-Saxon

(see p. 374)? Was he the great-nephew of the arch-traitor Eadric? Or was he the son of a churl somewhere near Sherstone, introduced by the Dane Ulf to the favour of Cnut? Or is it possible that none of these accounts rests on any sure foundation, and that we must remain absolutely in the dark as to the birth of Godwine and the events of his early life?

I will begin with the one fact which appears to be certain, that is, the name of Godwine's father. All the accounts of him, agreeing in nothing else, if they mention his father at all, agree in giving his father the name of Wulfnoth. I have therefore not scrupled to speak of him in the text as Godwine the son of Wulfnoth. Still, as Godwine was one of the commonest names at the time, it is not safe to assume every Godwine, or even every Wulfnoth, whom we come across to be the Godwine and the Wulfnoth with whom we are concerned. But any case of the conjunction of the two names is at least worthy of notice. There is absolutely no evidence whether any of the many signatures of various Godwines in the later days of Æthelred belong to the great Earl or not. But when the Ætheling Æthelstan, in his will (Cod. Dipl. iii. 363), makes bequests to two Godwines, and distinguishes one of them as the son of Wulfnoth, this raises a strong presumption, though it is by no means positive proof, that our Godwine is the Godwine intended. And, if the expressions of the bequest seem to fall in with any circumstances in any of the accounts of Godwine, we reach, though still not positive proof, yet certainly a high degree of probability.

What then is our available evidence on the subject? Our own historians, as far as direct statement goes, are silent. Godwine appears in the Chronicles as Earl of the West-Saxons and chief supporter of Harthacnut, without any hint as to who he was. The writers who speak of his exploits in the time of Cnut are equally silent. Even his own panegyrist, the biographer of Eadward, has absolutely nothing to tell us as to his origin. The silence of the Chronicles is not wonderful; they commonly take people's position for granted, and introduce them without any particular description. But the absence of any direct statement in all our authorities, good and bad, is certainly remarkable, and the silence of Godwine's own special admirer is very remarkable indeed.

But, though none of our own historians introduce Godwine as the son or nephew of Wulfnoth, or of Eadric, or of any one else, yet we have, on authority which seems at first sight to be irresistible, two statements that a Wulfnoth was the father of Godwine, one statement that Eadric was the great-uncle of Godwine. Florence (anno 1007), in a passage which I have referred to in the text (see p. 373), says that one of Eadric's brothers was named Æthelmær, and that Æthelmær was the father of Wulfnoth, the father of Earl Godwine. The Canterbury Chronicle (anno 1008) describes Child Wulfnoth the South-Saxon as "Godwines fæder eorles." Most writers put these two statements together, and assume Godwine to be the son of Child Wulfnoth and Child Wulfnoth to be the nephew of Eadric. To me it seems that these two accounts are quite distinct, and that their statements are almost irreconcilable. Florence, who makes Godwine the son of Wulfnoth the nephew of Eadric, does not say that Godwine was the son of Child Wulfnoth, nor does he in any way identify Child Wulfnoth with Wulfnoth the nephew of Eadric. The Canterbury Chronicler, who makes Godwine the son of Child Wulfnoth, is equally silent as to any kindred between Child Wulfnoth and Eadric. In fact, the way in which they write seems to exclude—perhaps is designedly meant to exclude—any such kindred either way. Florence speaks of "Wlnothus, pater West-Saxonum Duc Godwini;" directly afterwards he speaks of "Suth-Saxonice minister Wlnothus." This is the way in which a man would speak of two distinct Wulfnoths, not of the same. He says that "Brihtric, brother of Eadric, unjustly accused Child Wulfnoth." This is not the way in which he would speak of a charge brought by one member of the family of which he had just given the pedigree against another member of the same family. *Præ facie* then, the Wulfnoth spoken of under 1007 and the Wulfnoth spoken of under 1008 are two different persons. Nor is enough to say that, in the entry under 1008, Florence is translating the Worcester Chronicle, and that he keeps its language without trying to harmonize it with what he had himself just before said. Florence is here not merely translating, for he stops to put in a character of Brihtric of his own composition. It is certain that Florence cannot be quoted on behalf of the statement


that Godwine was the son of Child Wulfnoth ; he seems indeed designedly to exclude any such parentage by distinguishing one Wulfnoth from the other.

The three elder Chronicles, Abingdon, Worcester, Peterborough, give us no information either way. Godwine's name does not occur in any of them till after the death of Cnut. The Abingdon Chronicle simply says, "Brihtric, Eadrices broðor ealdormannes, forwregde Wulfnoð cild to þam cyninge." To the description "Wulfnoð cild" the Worcester and Peterborough Chronicles add "þone Suðseaxscian," the Canterbury Chronicler adds again, "Godwines fæder eorles." All the Chroniclers knew, and they thought it right to state, that Brihtric was the brother of Eadric ; that he was the uncle of the man whom he was accusing, a fact surely quite as important, is not implied in any way. The combined evidence of all the Chronicles seems to me to go to distinguish Child Wulfnoth the South-Saxon from any Wulfnoth who was nephew to Eadric. The evidence of Florence goes the same way. As to the parentage of Godwine the three elder Chroniclers are silent. Florence affirms him to have been the son of Wulfnoth the nephew of Eadric ; the Canterbury Chronicler affirms him to have been the son of Child Wulfnoth the South-Saxon. I do not say that these two statements are logically contradictory ; but it certainly seems to me that, as a matter of historical evidence, they are very hard to reconcile.

Now which of these two accounts is the more probable ? As far as authority goes, they are much on a level. Neither statement is strictly contemporary ; indeed both of them are statements which in their own nature could not be contemporary ; Wulfnoth, whoever he was, is described by a form which could not have been used till long after, when his son had become far more famous than himself. Each description is a mere insertion into an earlier text ; each may be a mere hasty inference from likeness of name. The authority of Florence on such a matter seems quite equal to that of the Canterbury Chronicle, the latest and least authoritative of the four. His statement too, part of an insertion of some length, describing the character and family of Eadric, has more the air of a deliberately advised statement than the three words of the

Canterbury Chronicler, which might have been inserted *currente calamo*. On the other hand the statement of Florence is highly improbable in itself, while that of the Canterbury Chronicler has some external support of a very remarkable kind.

If we admit that Godwine was the great-nephew of Eadric, we are at once plunged into all sorts of chronological difficulties and into the strangest possible family relations. Eadric was put to death in 1017; there is nothing to show that he was at all an aged man, rather the contrary. Godwine must have been at least a grown man in 1018, when he was already an Earl. Is it possible that Godwine was two generations younger than Eadric? Again, Eadric married Eadgyth the daughter of Æthelred; Eadward the son of Æthelred married Eadgyth the daughter of Godwine. It is probable that Eadric was a good deal older than his wife, who, as the daughter of a man who was born in 969, must have been young, and may have been almost a child, in 1007, the probable year of her marriage (see p. 363). Eadgyth again must have been some years older than her half-brother Eadward, who was born between 1003 and 1005 (see pp. 332, 409). Eadward again must have been much older than his wife Eadgyth, whose parents were married in 1019 (see p. 467). Still, allowing for all this, can we conceive a man marrying the great-great-niece of his own brother-in-law? The pedigree would stand thus;



Eadward may easily have been twenty years older than his wife, but can we believe that he belonged to the same generation as his wife's great-grandfather?

This seems to me to be a strong objection to the statement of Florence. On the other hand, the statement of the Canterbury Chronicle curiously falls in with the bequest in the will of the Ætheling Æthelstan. "Ic gean Godwine Wulfnôðes suna ðes landes æt Cumtúne, ðe his feder ær áhte." Why should Æthelstan leave Godwine the land which his father had? Some

special cause evidently lurks under such a bequest as this. Now the lands of Child Wulfnoth would doubtless be confiscated after his doings in 1009; they might easily come into the possession of the Ætheling; the Ætheling now grants part of them again to the son of their old owner. For a possession of Child Wulfnoth the South-Saxon we naturally look in his own shire. And Domesday shows us two South-Saxon Comptons, one of them held by Harold (21 a), the other held by a tenant of Earl Godwine (24 a). Here is, not indeed actual proof, but a remarkable series of undesigned coincidences in favour of the belief that Godwine was the son of Child Wulfnoth the South-Saxon, and therefore, as I think, against the belief that he was the great-nephew of Eadric.

This evidence, if it stood alone, would probably be thought quite conclusive; but there is another account of Godwine's birth, which we could hardly, in any case, accept in its literal shape, but the existence of which is, in any case, a phænomenon to be accounted for, and which, when stripped of its romantic details, is by no means devoid of intrinsic probability. This is that Godwine was the son of a churl near the field of Sherstone.

Ralph the Black, a chronicler of no great value, who wrote early in the thirteenth century, gives an account of Godwine, which is more than half mythical, but which is of some importance, because some of the statements in it clearly do not come from the common English sources. I quoted one specimen in the text (p. 467), relating to Godwine's marriage. His account of Godwine runs thus (p. 160); "*Godwinus Comes filius bubulci fuit; in mensâ Regis Edwardi offâ suffocatus est, et ab Haraldo filio sub mensâ extractus. Hic Godwinus, à Rege Cnutone nutritus, processu temporis in Daciam cum breve Regis transmissus, callidè duxit sororem Cnutonis.*" A few pages before (157) Ralph had given us his version of the fate of Ælfred; "*Alter frater, Aluredus scilicet, ad stipitem ligatus a Godwino in Hely peremptus est, ter decimatis commilitonibus apud Guldedune, post mortem Haroldi, antequam regnaret Hardecnutus, consilio Stigandi archiepiscopi.*" (This last strange statement may be taken in connexion with the scandal which charged Emma herself with a partnership in the deed. See pp. 544, 555,

564.) Here we have the common Norman tales mixed up with tales which, true or false, come from some quite different quarter.

Now it is well known that the *Knytlinga Saga* (c. 11. *Antiquitates Celto-Scandicæ*, p. 131) gives a fuller account of Godwine, developing the words "*filius bubulci fuit*" into a picturesque story. Earl Ulf, pursuing the flying English at Sherstone, loses his way. He meets a youth driving cattle, who tells him that his name is Godwine (*Gudini*), and whom he asks to show him his way to the Danish ships. Godwine speaks of the difficulty of so doing, when the whole country is so enraged against the Danes; he refuses the Earl's offered present of a gold ring, but says that he will do what he can for him, and that, if he succeeds, Ulf may reward him at his pleasure. He then takes the Earl to the house of his father Wulfnoth (*Ulnad*), who is described as a rich yeoman (*bondi*), living in very comfortable style. The Earl is well entertained, especially with good drink; he is greatly pleased with the house and its inhabitants, old and young, and stays the whole of the next day there in great comfort. At night Ulf and Godwine are mounted on two good horses, well caparisoned. Wulfnoth and his wife remind Ulf of the dangerous errand on which they are sending their only son, and trust to his gratitude for a recompense. The Earl is charmed with the handsome countenance and ready speech of the youth; they ride all night, and reach Cnut's ships the next morning. Ulf treats Godwine as his son, places him by his side, gives him his sister Gytha in marriage, presents him to Cnut, and procures for him the dignity of Earl.

Now the *Knytlinga Saga* is a *Saga*, and I have given some specimens of its inaccuracies and confusions. In this very story it would be hard to reconcile the author's conception of the battle of Sherstone with the truth of history; Godwine also, (see Edwards, *Introduction to Liber de Hydâ*, xxxvii. Mon. Angl. i. 210 ed. 1855. ii. 428, 430 new ed.); and it is more amazing still when the *Saga* goes on to tell us that Godwine and Gytha were the parents, not only of Swegen, Harold, and Tostig, but also of Morkere and Waltheof. Such a tale is not

history; the utmost amount of credit which I should ever think of giving it would be to admit it as evidence of a tradition that Godwine was not of illustrious birth, that he was by origin *Ceorl* and not *Eorl*. The existence of an independent English tradition to that effect is shown by the passage in Ralph the Black, and by another passage in a still later writer—but, for such a purpose, the later the better—in the Hyde Chronicle (p. 288). In his account of Godwine, against whom he is bitterly prejudiced, he says, “Fuit nempe ex infimo Anglorum genere . . . et licet per omnes fere Angliæ partes potestas ejus extenderetur, principalis tamen comitatus ejus Australis erat, regio quæ linguâ eorum dicitur Sudsexia.” This passage is doubly remarkable. It asserts Godwine to have been of low birth. This is a piece of independent tradition, as other writers talk of Godwine’s nobility (see Will. Gem. vii. 11. Bromton, as quoted p. 574). It also, like the Canterbury Chronicle, specially connects Godwine with Sussex. Most of the later writers connect him specially with Kent. On the other hand, if any one ventures to put any faith in the geography of the Knytlinga Saga, Godwine must have come from some place near the borders of Gloucestershire and Wiltshire.

We have then a distinct tradition, turning up in three quarters, none of which is likely to have borrowed from the other, asserting Godwine to have been a man of *ceorlish* birth. The two English writers exaggerate, as, in such a case, they were sure to do, the lowliness of his origin. So do the only modern writers who adopt the story, Sharon Turner (Hist. of Angl. Sax. ii. 494), who talks about “poverty,” “humble mansion,” &c., and Thierry (i. 160), who talks about a “cabane.” But the Wulfnoth of the Saga is not a poor man; he is a *Ceorl* and not a *Thegn*; but he has everything good about him, good house, good drink, good horses; he is, in modern phrase, not a labourer, not even a tenant farmer, but clearly a rich yeoman. Such a man might, in the England of those days, easily rise to *Thegn*’s rank (see above, p. 95). Eadric had risen from such a rank, or very possibly from a lowlier one (see p. 354), to be Ealdorman of the Mercians and son-in-law of the King. Still the rise from the yeoman’s comfortable house to the Earldom of the West-Saxons in one generation and to the throne of England in the next

is not an every-day event. How far is such an exaltation probable in the present case?

I assume that the story of the *Knytlinga Saga* is altogether irreconcilable with either of the others. Sharon Turner indeed, like Florence in some of his weaker moments, adopts all three stories at once. He accepts the pedigree given by Florence without hesitation, and apparently without considering it contradictory to the tale of Godwine's lowly origin which he also adopts. Indeed he represents Wulfnoth in his humble estate, as perhaps remembering the high fortunes of his uncle Eadric, and hoping that a similar good luck may attend his own child. Somewhat earlier, in recording the story of Brihtric and Wulfnoth, Mr. Turner calls the latter "the father of Earl Godwine," and, though he remarks in a note that the words are absent from some MSS. of the *Chronicles*, he does not appear to doubt Child Wulfnoth's paternity. Now it would be remarkable if the nephew of the powerful Eadric remained in the condition of a herdman or even in that of a yeoman, while Eadric himself had risen to such greatness, and had exalted at least one of his brothers with him. Yet this, however unlikely, is at least possible. But possibility itself can hardly be stretched so far as to identify Wulfnoth the naval commander of 1009 with Wulfnoth the yeoman of 1016. Unquestionably princes and lords, under the frown of fortune, have before now lurked in such disguises, but one who, outlaw as he was, still remained at the head of twenty ships, was far more likely to take service under King Swend or to continue his proceedings as Wiking on his own account, than to betake himself to agricultural pursuits in a western shire. I think we may safely assert that, if Godwine was the son of a West of England yeoman, he was certainly not the son of the South-Saxon naval captain, and was not likely to be the grand-nephew of Ealdorman Eadric.

And now, what is the measure of probability in the story itself? First of all, what is always of no small consequence in these questions, if we grant the truth of the tale in its main outlines, we can understand how the contrary one arose, while the reverse process is by no means so easy. For, if the tale in the *Knytlinga Saga* be a fiction, it must be pure invention without motive. One does not see how any confusion or

misconception can have led to it. The story of Godwine's lowly birth is not introduced in the Saga, whatever we say of the Winchester writer, with the least notion of depreciating him. One therefore hardly sees why any one should go out of his way to invent the tale. But, if there were several contemporary Wulfnoths, especially if the real one in question was an obscure person, mere misconception might lead Florence or his informants to fasten the paternity upon the wrong Wulfnoth. Or, if falsification is supposed, its motives are much more obvious than in the other case. To connect Godwine either with Eadric or with Child Wulfnoth would suit foes who wished to brand one whom they called a traitor as the kinsman of earlier traitors. It might suit Danish friends to represent him as connected with one who was so conspicuous in setting up the Danish throne in England. And, as Eadric, with all his crimes, was clearly the leader of a powerful party, the invention might even suit some among Godwine's English friends, who might still regard a connexion with Eadric as conferring more of honour than of infamy.

Again, if we accept the legend in the Saga, we can understand the rather mysterious way in which Godwine himself comes on the stage under the patronage of Canute and Ulf, better than if we suppose him to have been a member of a powerful English family. We can especially understand the astonishing silence of his own panegyrist. If Godwine had been a scion of any eminent family, or connected with any famous, or even infamous, men, we should surely, somewhere or other, find him described accordingly. But the mass of writers, as we have seen, are utterly silent; no one introduces him with any description at all; those who connect him with Eadric or with Child Wulfnoth do it backwards; they describe Wulfnoth as the father of Godwine, not Godwine as the son of Wulfnoth.

I think then that, if this story stood by itself, there would be little difficulty in accepting it. I mean of course in accepting the general outline of the tale, namely that Godwine was a yeoman's son who had somehow attracted the favour of Ulf, and who was by him introduced to Cnut. Details are quite another matter. The whole narrative of the War of Cnut and Eadmund in the Knytlinga Saga is so utterly confused and unhistorical that

nothing can be safely said as to time, place, or circumstance. But the tradition of Godwine's churlish origin, taken by itself, would have much to be said for it. I am inclined to think it might hold its ground against the version in Florence. But the statement of the Canterbury Chronicler, backed up by the will of Æthelstan, is a more formidable opponent. The two descriptions fit so singularly well into one another, and the coincidence is, on the face of it, undesigned. It is of course possible that Godwine the son of Wulfnoth and legatee of Æthelstan may not have been the great Earl; it is possible that, being the great Earl, he may have been the son of some other Wulfnoth, and not of the South-Saxon Child. But when we put together the Canterbury Chronicle, the will of Æthelstan, and the entries in Domesday, their cumulative force is so great as to make such explanations mere possibilities and no more. If we accept the will referring to the great Godwine, and further accept my conjecture as to the death of Æthelstan (see pp. 409, 422), we may look on Godwine as a brave young warrior, whose services under Eadmund entitled him in the Ætheling's opinion to restitution of the lands forfeited by his father. This view of him is in no way inconsistent with the fact of the favour which he afterwards found with Ulf and Cnut. Nor is his favour with Ulf and Cnut inconsistent with the story of his yeoman origin, but quite the reverse. The main difficulty, one which seems to be quite insuperable, is that Wulfnoth the churl and Child Wulfnoth the South-Saxon cannot be the same man.

The two stories thus become alternatives between which we must choose. Godwine was either the son of Child Wulfnoth, or of Wulfnoth the churl; in neither case do I believe him to have been the great-nephew of Eadric. I once inclined, of course with the necessary allowances, to the story in the Knytlinga Saga; I had not then weighed the evidence suggested by the will of Æthelstan and the entries in Domesday. On the strength of these last I now incline to the statement of the Canterbury Chronicler. But I leave the critical reader to decide.

NOTE G. p. 458.

THE DEATH OF EADRIC.

THE accounts of the death of Eadric form an excellent example of the growth of a legend. Each writer knows more about it than the one immediately before him.

The three elder Chronicles, under the year 1017, simply record the execution of Eadric; "On þisum geare wæs Eadric ealdorman ofslagen."

The Canterbury Chronicler adds the place, London, and volunteers his own conviction that the execution was righteous; "Eadric ealdorman wearð ofslagan on Lundene swyðe rihtlice."

Florence adds that the execution happened at Christmas, in the palace, and that the body of Eadric was thrown over the wall of the city, and left unburied. He also tells us Cnut's motive, namely fear lest Eadric should some day betray him, as he had betrayed his former lords Æthelred and Eadmund.

William of Malmesbury (ii. 181) knows Eadric's fate after death; "Putidum spiritum dimisit ad inferos." He has also more to tell us than his predecessors about his last sayings and doings in this world. Cnut and Eadric quarrelled, he does not know about what; but Eadric began to recount all his services, amongst other things, how he first forsook Eadmund and then slew him for Cnut's sake. Cnut waxes wroth, and says that Eadric must die, because he has slain his own Lord and Cnut's sworn brother. His blood shall be on his own head, because he has borne witness against himself that he has slain the Lord's anointed. For fear of a tumult the King has Eadric at once stifled to death (*fauces elisus*) in the room where they were, namely, his own bedchamber, and has the body thrown through the window into the Thames.

Henry of Huntingdon makes Eadric come to Cnut directly after the murder of Eadmund and salute him as sole King. Cnut asks the meaning of the title, which Eadric explains, saying how he has procured Eadmund's death. Cnut answers that for so great a service, he will set him higher than all the

Witan of England. So he cuts off his head, and sets it on pole on the highest tower in London.

Æthelred of Rievaulx (X Scriptt. 365) has the same story with a few verbal changes. He sets the head on the highest *gate* of London. The gate and the tower may or may not be the same thing, but we have now clearly come to the beginning of the practice of exposing heads on Temple-Bar.

Roger of Wendover (i. 460) tells William of Malmesbury's story, only adding the subject of dispute between Cnut and Eadric, which William of Malmesbury could not tell us. Eadric complained of being deprived of his Earldom of Mercia, a singular complaint, as Cnut had only that year confirmed him in it. He also tells Henry of Huntingdon's story as an alternative.

Bromton (X Scriptt. 908) gives both versions with slight improvements on each. William's version is enriched by the detail that Eadric's hands and feet were tied when he was thrown out of the window. This was the mode of his death, for in this version we do not hear of his being stifled. To the other story the only addition is that, when his head was set on the gate, his body was thrown over the wall.

Lastly, Knighton (X Scriptt. 2318) follows William, but gives us Eadric's speech at greater length and tells us that it was made before dinner. Also we now hear that he was thrown into the Thames from the window of a high tower; his hands and feet were tied, and he was thrown out by a machine—a sling or catapult.

The turning-point of these changes is when, in the version of William of Malmesbury, there comes in the first allusion to the Amalekite who slew Saul. When this parallel was once thought of, the true date of Eadric's execution, namely the thirteenth month after Eadmund's death, no longer suited the tale; the date of the story was therefore moved back, and Eadric was made to announce the murder of Eadmund and to be put to death at once. For the details, the writers at each stage of course drew on their imaginations.

NOTE H. p. 475.

WYRTGEORN KING OF THE WENDS.

I CANNOT pretend to any special knowledge of Slavonic history, and I must confess that I am quite unable to identify this King Wyrtegeorn. There was however a very eminent Slavonic prince at this time, who was closely connected with Cnut, and who spent some time with him in England. I do not know whether the two can be in any way identified, or whether there has been any confusion between them.

The person I mean is Godescalc the son of Uto the Obotrite, a Wendish prince whose exploits will be found recorded in the *Chronica Sclavica* ap. Lindenbrog, capp. 13, 14 (Hamburg, 1706), in Helmoldi *Chronicon Slavorum*, i. 19–25 (Frankfurt, 1581), in a short notice of Saxo, p. 196, and in a variety of passages of Adam of Bremen, ii. 64, 75. iii. 18, 21, 45, 50, 70. In his youth he was sent as a student to Lüneburg, but, hearing of his father's death at the hands of the neighbouring Saxons, he gave over his studies, renounced his faith, put himself at the head of his heathen countrymen, and carried on a fierce war with the Saxons of Holstein and Stormaria. The freemen of Thetmarsen alone withstood him. He was then brought to a better mind by a rebuke received from a Christian, which has a somewhat legendary sound. He was soon afterwards taken prisoner by Bernard the Second, Duke of the Saxons (1010–1062), who after a while released him, seemingly on condition that he should leave the country. He then joined himself to Cnut, entered his service, seemingly as an officer of the Housecarls, served in his wars, and was rewarded with the hand of his daughter—no doubt a mistake for sister—whose name is given as Demmyn. He was in England at the time of Cnut's death, on which, like Eglaf (see p. 494), he returned to his own country. After some fighting, he recovered his inheritance, and devoted himself to the spread of Christianity among his countrymen. He not only built and endowed churches, but became personally a missionary, translating into the vulgar tongue what the clergy preached in Latin or German. He waged some wars in concert with Duke

Bernard, and his power seems to have been sensibly diminished after that prince's death. At last, in 1066, he suffered martyrdom at the hands of his heathen subjects, at the instigation of his brother-in-law Blusso. With him suffered John, Bishop of Mecklenburg, who was sacrificed to the Slavonic god Radegast, and others of his companions, both clergy and laity. Godescalc's wife, the Danish princess, was sent away naked, several of his sons were killed, but one, Henry, took refuge with his cousin Swend in Denmark, and afterwards avenged his father's death. On the death of Godescalc, the whole Wendish country relapsed into heathenism.

Godescalc is so interesting a character that we should certainly be well pleased to connect him with England as closely as we can. But I do not know how far we are justified in identifying him with the Wyrtegeorn of Florence. There is also a single charter of 1026 (Cod. Dipl. iv. 33) which is signed (along with the Earls Godwine, Hakon, Hrani, and Sihtric) by an Earl Wrytesleof, whose name certainly has a very Slavonic sound.

END OF VOLUME THE FIRST.

February, 1867.]

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

Clarendon Press Series.

THE DELEGATES of the Oxford Press understand from eminent Schoolmasters and others who are authorities upon education, that there is still great need of good School Books and Manuals.

They are told that Editions with good English notes of many of the Greek and Latin Classics read in the higher classes of the Public Schools are required; that text-books, both English and Foreign, are much needed for the use of Schools, especially with reference to the Local Examinations held by the Universities; that good English and other Grammars, and Exercise Books adapted to them and with a copious supply of Examples, are much needed; and that there is a great and urgent want of Delectuses, Analecta, and generally of books of Selections from Authors, for use in Schools;—

That the Histories now read in Schools are greatly below present requirements, and in some cases there are absolute deficiencies; and that the want of good books on History is much felt in the Law and Modern History School in the University;—

That English Treatises on Physical Science, written with clearness and precision of language, and adapted for use in the higher classes of Schools, and in the Natural Science School of the University, do not exist.

They believe that the University may with propriety and efficiency do much towards remedying the defect. They have therefore determined to issue a series of Educational Works, hoping to supply some existing wants, and to help in improving methods of teaching.

The departments of Education which they propose to deal with at present are the following :—

I. CLASSICS. The Delegates hope to issue

1. Works suitable for the Universities and the highest forms of Schools ; or
2. Books for School-work generally, beginning from the very rudiments.

II. MATHEMATICAL WORKS ; both for University Students, and also with especial regard to the needs of Middle Class Schools.

III. HISTORY. Here again there will be two classes of books :—

1. Short Histories, such as may be useful for the History School, or for general reading ;
2. School Histories, with all the necessary appliances for education.

IV. LAW.

V. PHYSICAL SCIENCE. The experience of teachers in the University and elsewhere has already pointed out several desirable works, and has also gone some way towards providing the books required.

VI. ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, which will comprise a carefully compiled series of Reading Books, Exercise Books, and Grammars.

VII. MODERN LANGUAGES.

VIII. A MISCELLANEOUS CLASS ; including Handbooks on Art, Music, Literature, and the like.

IX. ENGLISH CLASSICS ; a series of reprints of some of the masterpieces in our language, chiefly for the use of Schools.

The DELEGATES OF THE PRESS invite suggestions and advice from all persons interested in sound education ; and will be thankful for hints, &c., addressed to the Rev. G. W. KITCHIN, Walton Manor, Oxford.

Just Published.

1. **Descriptive Astronomy. A Handbook for the** general reader, and also for practical Observatory work. With 224 illustrations and numerous tables. By G. F. CHAMBERS, F.R.A.S., Barrister-at-Law. (Demy 8vo. cloth, 856 pp., price 21s.)

The aim of this work, briefly expressed, is general usefulness, whether in the hands of the student, the general reader, or the professional observer. Great pains have been taken to present the latest information on all branches of the science. The development of Astronomy is now so rapid that unless an author exercises constant vigilance his book must fall behindhand: and it is believed that this volume not only contains the most recent discoveries and deductions, but that in it will also be found information hitherto to be met with only in the publications of learned Societies, difficult of access and inconvenient for reference even to the Astronomer, and absolutely out of the reach of the general reader.

2. **A Treatise on Natural Philosophy. Volume I.** By Sir W. THOMSON, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Glasgow, and P. G. TAIT, M.A., Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh; formerly Fellows of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. [*Nearly ready.*]

"Our object is twofold: to give a tolerably complete account of what is now known of Natural Philosophy, in language adapted to the non-mathematical reader; and to furnish, to those who have the privilege which high mathematical acquirements confer, a connected outline of the analytical process by which the greater part of that knowledge has been extended into regions as yet unexplored by experiment.

* * * * *

"We commence with a chapter on *Motion*, a subject totally independent of the existence of *Matter* and *Force*. In this we are naturally led to the consideration of the curvature and tortuosity of curves, the curvature of surfaces, and various other purely geometrical subjects.

* * * * *

"Chapter II. gives NEWTON'S Laws of Motion in his own words, and with some of his own commentaries; every attempt that has yet been made to supersede them having ended in utter failure.

"Chapter III. briefly treats of Observation and Experiment as the basis of Natural Philosophy.

"Chapter IV. deals with the fundamental Units, and the chief instruments used for the measurement of Time, Space, and Force.

"Thus closes the First Division of the Work, which is strictly preliminary.

"The Second Division is devoted to Abstract Dynamics, (commonly of late years, but not well, called Mechanics). Its object is briefly explained in the introductory (fifth) Chapter, and the rest of the present volume is devoted to Statics.

"Chapter VI., after a short notice of the Statics of a Particle, enters into considerable detail on the important subject of Attraction.

"In Chapter VII. the Statics of Solids and Fluids are treated with special detail in various important branches, such as the Deformation of Elastic Solids and the Figure of the Earth.

"We believe that the mathematical reader will especially profit by a perusal of the large type portion of this Volume, as he will thus be forced to think out for himself what he has been too often accustomed to reach by a mere mechanical application of analysis. Nothing can be more fatal to progress than a too confident reliance upon mathematical symbols; for the student is only too apt to take the easier course, and consider the *formula* and not the *fact* as the physical reality."—*From the Authors' Preface.*

3. **Chemistry for Students.** By **A. W. WILLIAMSON**,
Phil. Doc., F.R.S., Professor of Chemistry, University College, London.
(Crown 8vo. cloth, price 7s. 6d.)

Also: **Solutions of the Problems in "Chemistry for Students."** By the same Author. (Crown 8vo. sewed, price 6d.)

"Within less than four hundred pages of a **handy little** volume, in type not fatiguing to the eye, Professor Williamson here gives to the student an outline of the leading facts and principles of inorganic and organic chemistry."

"This volume is really a too rare example of what a good elementary text-book in any science ought to be: the language brief, simple, exact; the arrangement logical, developing in lucid order principles from facts, and keeping theory always dependent upon observation; a book that keeps the reason of the student active while he strives to master details difficult but never without interest, and that furnishes him with means for practising himself in the right management of each new tool of knowledge that is given to him for his use."—*Examiner*.

4. **An Elementary Treatise on Heat, with numerous woodcuts and diagrams.** By **BALFOUR STEWART**, LL.D., F.R.S., Director of the Observatory at Kew. (Crown 8vo., cloth, price 7s. 6d.)

"In this work the Author endeavours to place before his readers in an elementary form the facts and principles of the Science of Heat, and also to give some of the most prominent practical applications of our knowledge of this subject. He begins with the study of well-ascertained facts, and proceeds onwards to general principles.

"The work is divided into three parts:—

"1. The study of the various Effects produced on Bodies by Heat.

"2. The Laws which regulate the Distribution of Heat through Space. Theoretic views are here first introduced.

"3. The Nature of Heat, its Sources, and Connexion with other Properties of Matter.

"The work is chiefly intended for students of Physical Science; but it is hoped that it may also interest general readers by placing before them some of the most remarkable and most practical and valuable truths arrived at by modern researches into the nature and qualities of heat."—*From the Author's Preface*.

"All persons engaged in the teaching or study of experimental philosophy will be glad to have a manual from the pen of a gentleman competent to treat the subject, and bringing his information in it up to the science of the present day. Whilst the book is thoroughly practical and adapted for use in the class-room, Dr. Stewart has not neglected to discuss the interesting relations of heat to other forms of force, and the bearing of the phenomena of heat on the theories of 'conservation of energy' and 'dissipation of energy' in the Universe. This book is one of the Clarendon Press Series; and we are glad to find that the publishers have promised other manuals on scientific subjects, which, from the distinguished names of their authors, promise to be equally interesting and useful with the present volume on Heat."—*Athenæum*.

"The highest praise we can give this volume is to say that it is entitled to its place in the remarkable series which is now in the course of issue from the Clarendon Press, and that it follows not unworthily the *Chemistry* of Professor Williamson and the *Greek Verbs* of Mr. Veitch. Such manuals, so admirable in matter, arrangement, and type, were never before given to the world at the same moderate price. Our ideas of the nature of heat, as the author observes, have recently undergone a great change. Heat is now regarded, not as a species of matter, but as a species of motion; and the relation between it and the other forms of motion, involving the principles of the science of energy, constitutes, perhaps, the most exciting study of the day, being just in the stage which keeps everybody on tiptoe

of expectation. The publication, then, of this manual is exceedingly well timed ; it includes within narrow limits the leading facts and principles of this youngest-born of the Sciences, and for the mastery of the greater portion of its contents only requires ordinary intelligence on the part of the reader."—*Spectator*.

"Dr. Balfour Stewart's 'Elementary Treatise on Heat' will not frighten readers away by its heaviness, as its author says his say in 379 pages of text ; but brevity is not secured at the expense of completeness, for he is able to give a full sketch of his subject, enlivened and illustrated by some fifty engravings, exclusive of diagrams. The woodcuts, representing apparatus and experiments, seem to be remarkably good of their kind, clear and intelligible. In contrasting this volume with other text-books of similar pretensions, we are struck with its superiority in point of arrangement, and in the manner in which it presents the results of the most recent researches on the subject. It has been successful, too, in mastering another difficulty which besets the writers of text-books, and that is in drawing the line between the merely popular treatise and the dry compendium. There is an attractive and lucid description of experiments with the thermo-electric pile, on radiant heat and the diathermancy of different substances, and plenty to exercise the student's powers in the chapters on dilatation, the theory of exchange, and connection of heat with other forms of energy."—*London Review*.

"This compact little treatise is commendable both as an elementary exposition of the chief phenomena of heat and their practical applications, and also as a brief exposition of the philosophical theories which have recently given a new interest to the phenomena. The structure of the work is also excellent."—*Fortnightly Review*.

5. Greek Verbs, Irregular and Defective; their forms, meaning, and quantity ; embracing all the Tenses used by Greek writers, with references to the passages in which they are found. By W. VEITCH. New and revised edition. (Crown 8vo. cloth, 616 pp., price 8s. 6d.)

"The 'Clarendon Press Series' makes an excellent start, and if its succeeding volumes are to combine anything like the distinctive merits of the first, it is destined to supersede every other series already in use. Mr. Veitch's work on the *Irregular and Defective Greek Verbs* is as signal a proof as could be furnished that a book designed to assist the learner or the advanced student may be convenient in size and yet exhaustive in treatment, may be quite original in investigation and yet fall readily into the educational channel, may confine itself to the strictest exposition of phenomena, and yet be fresh with the force of character and lively with the humour that belong more or less to all inquiring and independent minds.

"We shall not pretend to review the treatise of an author who stands very nearly, if not altogether, alone in knowledge of his subject. Mr. Veitch is indeed as independent of the praise or the censure of critics as any author need care to be. It is one of his claims to the gratitude of scholars that, in spite of the premature and almost universal desertion of the field of rigid, textual scholarship, for the easier, showier, and pleasanter field of aesthetic or literary disquisition, he has persevered in his forsaken and solitary path, and has produced a work unique of its kind, full of fresh and lasting contributions to our knowledge of the Greek language, and intellectually vivacious and incisive on nearly every page. Open the book anywhere, and instances of erroneous doctrines corrected, of omissions (common to all our lexicons) supplemented, of new theories propounded and vindicated, occur at once. Indeed there is scarcely an authority, whether editor, lexicographer, or grammarian, British or Continental, whom Mr. Veitch has not occasion to correct, modify, or supplement. The German Diindorf, the Dutch Cobet, the French Littré, the English Liddell and Scott, are a few among living scholars who are repeatedly brought to the touchstone of comprehensive induction and acute judgment, while the dicta of departed authorities are canvassed with a freedom which would be almost cruel, were it not uniformly so just. We congratulate Mr. Veitch on the completion, and the Clarendon Press on the pub-

lication, of a work which will reinstate our scholarship in that esteem which the Germans have almost ceased to entertain for it since the days of Porson and Elmsley, and which will have the merit not only of purifying the fountain-heads of classical education, but of affording the youthful scholar an example of that moral singleness of purpose and undeviating search for truth which are even rarer than the intellectual gifts that have been lavished on its execution."—*Spectator*.

"The book before us by Mr. William Veitch is quite a wonderful contribution to critical knowledge of Greek, and has been selected by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press to lead off a new series of educational works. Its great distinction, in the first place, is that it is all derived from original reading. Mr. Veitch has gone with a careful finger through the Greek texts, and the Greek texts in their latest recensions, marking every noticeable form, and checking by his own personal examination the dicta of other critics. * * * * The book is useful, indeed we may say indispensable, to scholars, in the widest sense of the word. It takes a larger range than its mere title would imply; and besides being a supplement to our best Lexicons, such as that of Liddell and Scott, contains touches of fine philology which would have delighted Porson and Elmsley."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

"Mr. Veitch is master in his own subject, and has produced a book which is simply marvellous as a result of most extensive reading and scrupulous accuracy, combined with keen scholarship. For the Clarendon Press to head its series with this remarkable little book may be taken as a good omen for the classics in the University, which bears the reputation of upholding a style of scholarship that is rather broad than refined."—*London Review*.

6. The Golden Treasury of Ancient Greek Poetry;

being a Collection of the finest passages in the Greek-Classic Poets, with Introductory Notices and Notes. By R. S. WRIGHT, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. (Crown 8vo., cloth, price 8s. 6d.)

The arguments in favour of selections from the ancient classics grow stronger as the time lessens which men can devote to the dead languages. Especially in the case of those ancients whose writings are rather of poetical or literary than of historical importance, such as the Greek poets, it seems better that students who cannot work through more than a few thousand lines, should give a part of their labour to detached passages of varied excellence, than that they should spend all their strength on whole works of which many parts are inferior in interest. Not all parts even of the best Greek poems are of equal beauty: the finest pieces are as good occasions for grammatical and critical instruction as those which are less fine; and when the constructive art has been observed in a few whole works, there is much to be said in favour of a wider range and a less continuous but a more extended and, so far, a more complete survey of the general poetical world of Greece.

Again, a collection as well of the less known and accessible gems of Greek poetry as of more familiar passages from the greatest works may be of service to some even of those who no longer read Greek with a view to examinations.

No collection adapted to either of these purposes has yet been published: and the aim of this volume is to supply the want, by bringing together in a convenient form the finest passages of extant Greek verse from the *Iliad* to the later epigrammatists, so far as the limits of about seven thousand lines will allow.

A short statement of the subject of each passage is prefixed wherever such a statement appeared necessary to relieve the obscurity resulting from the absence of context; and in some cases of unusual difficulty, an analysis of the connexion of ideas is supplied in the margin. Historical introductions to the several poetical periods, addressed to the origin of each species of poetry and its connexion with the general history of the Greeks, and explanatory notes with occasional translations, are appended.

"We could wish that the advertisement of this anthology was rather less pretentious, for it is described as a 'collection of the finest passages in the principal

Greek Poets ;' a phrase with which advertisement columns have made us familiar. It implies too strongly the perfection of the compiler's critical acumen. This one thing said, we can honestly praise the collection itself. The introductions to the various periods of Greek literature are short essays full of spirit ; condensed, yet clear ; and a novelty which seems really useful, is a brief marginal analysis where the train of thought is obscure. The notes are a scholar's work, and shew a scholar's interest in his subject. The analyses of the specimen choruses from *Æschylus* and *Sophocles*, and the notes thereon, are excellent examples of short and pithy commentary."—*London Review*.

7. The Elements of Deductive Logic, designed mainly

for the use of Junior Students in the Universities. By the Rev. T. FOWLER, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College, Oxford. (Crown 8vo., cloth, price 3s. 6d.)

"The precise object of these pages is (without presupposing any technical acquaintance with logical terminology) to enable a student of average intelligence to acquire for himself an elementary knowledge of the main problems, principles, and rules of Deductive Logic. * * * *

"The Manuals of Sanderson, Wallis, Aldrich, &c., owing to the peculiar circumstances of the period in which they were written—a period which, being transitional, retained not only much of the scholastic terminology, but also much of the Realistic doctrine—have ceased to be adapted to modern instruction. The Author, with some misgivings, and a keen sense of the difficulties of the task, trusts that the present work may be found usefully to occupy their place. Its propositions cannot however be presented in the same curt and dogmatic shape, for we have learnt to regard many portions of Logic, like many portions of the sciences whose method it claims to analyse, as fairly open to differences of opinion. * * * *

"It is hoped that, independently of its bearing on University studies, a short English Manual of Logic may be used with advantage in the Upper Forms of Schools, and that it may not be without interest to the general reader."—*From the Author's Preface*.

"We think such a manual is very opportune. Oxford requires the study of a certain amount of logic in the academical course, but hitherto, Aldrich's Manual, in its strange Latin and with its inconsistent terminology, has been the only text-book upon which students commence their acquaintance with the science of logic. There are some who maintain that no English text-book can combine all the advantages of a Latin one, and thus Professor Mansel's edition of Aldrich, with notes and appendices, still serves to many or most as the introduction to logic. But this work pre-supposes more specific knowledge of the subject than beginners can be expected to bring, and the real need felt by students themselves for some elementary treatise, with which to break ground in a subject new to them, shews itself in the demand for Archbishop Thomson's 'Laws of Thought,' which as an intelligent English treatise on logic, both deductive and inductive, has much to recommend it, but is unsuited to the complete novice. Mr. Fowler's little work is not intended to be a substitute for more advanced treatises, but rather to put the general reader in possession of an outline of the science of logic, which will enable him to pursue the subject intelligently for himself on a more complete scale. It is a great thing to say of a manual of logic that it is not repulsive on first perusal, and a still higher praise to be able to describe it as not unattractive. Now, setting aside the necessary technicalities and mechanical details that must occur in every work on logic, we think this short treatise will be read with pleasure ; partly owing to a judicious arrangement of the subject into short chapters and paragraphs, and not less from the clearness and freshness of the style. It is a novel plan to add at the end of the chapters, in the form of a note, a brief statement of opinions differing from the views given in the text, with references to the various works where these opinions may be examined. In a science like logic, in which doctors have agreed to disagree, there is a pleasant honesty in this which gives us confidence in our guide. Among those portions of

the book which bear marks of the most original treatment, we should note the chapter on the various kinds of terms, which seem to us to be divided on a very intelligible principle. The same originality is conspicuous in Mr. Fowler's treatment of *definition*. * * * * It is no light praise to say of a treatise on logic that it is essentially a common-sense treatise; and we think that many who have sadly attained to their modicum of logic will wish that their first initiation into its mysteries had been through some such text-book."—*London Review*.

8. Specimens of Early English; being a Series of Extracts from the most important English Authors, Chronologically arranged, illustrative of the progress of the English Language and its Dialectic varieties, from A.D. 1250 to A.D. 1400. With Grammatical Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. By R. MORRIS, Esq., Editor of "The Story of Genesis and Exodus," &c. (Crown 8vo., cloth, price 7s. 6d.)

This work seeks to set before students of the English language a systematic view of its older forms and their development, as exhibited in writers of the latter part of the thirteenth and the whole of the fourteenth centuries: a most important period in the history of our language, though it has been but imperfectly investigated even by the best writers on the subject. Existing text-books on the history of English literature and language not only pass over much that is important in this period, but they also deal in a very unsatisfactory way with many chief authorities, whose style, language, and position are thought to be sufficiently illustrated if twenty or thirty lines are devoted to them. There is in fact no real knowledge of this period to be met with. This present work is intended, partially at least, to fill this blank. It presents a series of specimens selected so as to form a connected and continuous whole. Each passage chosen is of considerable length (the extracts varying from 200 to upwards of 1200 lines); so that the grammar, vocabulary, and manner of each author are completely represented to the student.

These specimens are arranged in chronological order, and illustrate the leading *dialects* of the early English period. They will be found to be (for the most part) new; having been chosen from works which have not usually been quoted and are not well known. In many cases the passages are re-edited from the best MSS.; a few of them now appear for the first time.

The work has a Grammatical Introduction, Notes, and a Glossary; and it is hoped that it may be within the reach and capacity of all who take an interest in the *origines* of our mother-tongue. It lays bare some of the strong foundations on which our language is built up; it throws some light on the ethnological and historical characteristics of its period; religion, manners, domestic habits, ranks and orders, of a very important time in the annals of this country are illustrated by it.

It is, however, specially intended for students in colleges in which the English language forms a part of the regular routine of instruction, and for candidates for the Civil and Indian Civil Service.

In course of preparation.**I. CLASSICS.**

1. Sophocles. By the Rev. LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A.,
Professor of Greek at St. Andrews, formerly Fellow of Queen's College,
Oxford.
2. Homer, Iliad I—XII. By D. B. MONRO, M.A.,
Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.
3. Homer, Odyssey I—XII.
4. ——— Odyssey XIII—XXIV. By ROBINSON ELLIS,
M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.
5. A Golden Treasury of Greek Prose, being a col-
lection of the finest passages in the principal Greek Prose Writers, with
Introductory Notices and Notes. By R. S. WRIGHT, M.A., Fellow of
Oriel College, and J. E. L. SHADWELL, B.A., Student of Christ Church.
6. Horace. With English Notes and Introduction.
By the Rev. E. WICKHAM, M.A., Fellow of New College, Oxford. Also
a small edition for Schools.
7. Livy I—X. By J. R. SEELEY, M.A., Fellow of
Christ's College, Cambridge; Professor of Latin, University College,
London. Also a small edition for Schools. *[In the Press.]*
8. Cicero. Select Letters. By the Rev. A. WATSON,
M.A., Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford.
9. Cicero. The Philippic Orations. By the Rev. J. R.
KING, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford.
10. Selections from the less known Latin Poets. By
the Rev. NORTH PINDEB, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College,
Oxford.
11. Selections from Xenophon (for Schools). With
English Notes and Maps. By J. S. PHILLPOTTS, B.C.L., Fellow of New
College, Oxford; Assistant Master in Rugby School.
12. The Commentaries of C. Jul. Caesar. Part. I. The
Gallic War, with English Notes, &c., by CHARLES E. MOBERLY, M.A.,
Assistant Master in Rugby School; formerly Scholar of Balliol College.
Also, to follow: Part II. The Civil War: by the same Editor.
13. Select Epistles of Cicero and Pliny (for Schools).
With English Notes, by the Rev. C. E. PRICHARD, M.A., formerly Fellow
of Balliol College.
14. Selections from Plato (for Schools). With English
Notes, by the Rev. B. JOWETT, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek, and
J. PURVES, B.A., Balliol College.

15. **The Elements of Greek Accentuation (for Schools):**
abridged from his larger work by H. W. CHANDLER, M.A., Fellow of
Pembroke College, Oxford.
16. **Cornelius Nepos (for Schools). With English**
Notes, by OSCAR BROWNING, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge,
and Assistant Master at Eton College.

II. MENTAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

1. **The Elements of Deductive Logic, designed mainly**
for the use of Junior Students in the Universities. By the Rev. T.
FOWLER, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College, Oxford. (Crown
8vo., cloth, price 3s. 6d.) *[Just published.]*

III. MATHEMATICS.

1. **An Elementary Treatise on Quaternions.**
By P. G. TAIT, M.A., Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University
of Edinburgh; formerly Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge.
[In the Press.]
2. **A Course of Lectures on Pure Geometry.**
By H. J. STEPHEN SMITH, M.A., F.R.S., Fellow of Balliol College, and
Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford.

IV. HISTORY.

1. **A History of Germany and of the Empire, down**
to the close of the Middle Ages. By J. BRYCE, M.A., Fellow of Oriel
College, Oxford.
2. **A History of British India.** By S. OWEN, M.A.,
Lee's Reader in Law and History, Christ Church; and Reader in Indian
Law in the University of Oxford.
3. **A History of Greece.** By E. A. FREEMAN, M.A.,
formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.
4. **A Constitutional History of England.** By the
Rev. W. STUBBS, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, and Regius
Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford.

V. LAW.

1. **The Institutes of Justinian, with Notes and an**
English Translation. By J. BRYCE, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College,
Oxford.
2. **Commentaries on Roman Law; from the original**
and the best modern sources. In Two Volumes, demy 8vo. By H. J.
ROBY, M.A., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; Pro-
fessor of Law at University College, London.

VI. PHYSICAL SCIENCE.

1. **A Treatise on Natural Philosophy.** In Four Volumes. By Sir W. THOMSON, LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S., Professor of Natural Philosophy, Glasgow, and P. G. TAIT, M.A., Professor of Natural Philosophy, Edinburgh; formerly Fellows of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. [Vol. I. nearly ready.]
2. By the same Authors, a smaller Work on the same subject, forming a complete Introduction to it, so far as it can be carried out with Elementary Geometry and Algebra. [In the Press.]
3. **Forms of Animal Life.** Illustrated by Descriptions and Drawings of Dissections. By G. ROLLESTON, M.D., F.R.S., Linacre Professor of Physiology, Oxford. [In the Press.]
4. **On Laboratory Practice.** By A. VERNON HARCOURT, M.A., Lee's Reader in Chemistry at Christ Church, and H. G. MADAN, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford.
5. **Geology.** By J. PHILLIPS, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S., Professor of Geology, Oxford.
6. **A Treatise on Mechanics.** By the Rev. B. PRICE, M.A., F.R.S., F.R.A.S., Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, and Sedleian Professor of Natural Philosophy.
7. **A Treatise on Acoustics.** By W. F. DONKIN, M.A., F.R.S., Savilian Professor of Astronomy, Oxford.
8. **A Treatise on Optics.** By R. B. CLIFTON, M.A., F.R.A.S., Professor of Experimental Philosophy, Oxford; formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
9. **A Treatise on Electricity.** By W. ESSON, M.A., Fellow and Mathematical Lecturer of Merton College, Oxford.
10. **A Treatise on Magnetism.**
11. **A Treatise on Mineralogy.**
12. **A Treatise on Crystallography.**
13. **A Treatise on Physiological Physics.**

VII. ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

1. **On the Principles of Grammar.** By the Rev. E. THRING, M.A., Head Master of Uppingham School.
Also, by the same Author, a Gradual, designed to serve as an Exercise and Composition Book in the English Language.
2. **The Philology of the English Tongue.** By the Rev. J. EABLE, M.A., formerly Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and Professor of Anglo-Saxon.

3. Reading Books. *[In the Press.]*

By the Author of "Mademoiselle Mori."

Part i. For Little Children, in bold type.

Part ii. For Junior Classes in Schools.

Part iii. For the Higher Classes in Schools.

Part iv. For all Readers.

4. Typical Selections from the best English Authors
from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century, (to serve as an higher
Reading Book,) with Introductory Notices and Notes, being a Contribution
towards a History of English Literature.

VIII. FRENCH. By Mons. JULES BUE,

Honorary M.A. of Oxford; Taylorian Teacher of French, Oxford;
Examiner in the Oxford Local Examinations from 1858.

1. A French Grammar. A complete Theory of the
French Language, with the rules in French and English, and numerous
Examples to serve as first Exercises in the Language.
2. A French Grammar Test. A Book of Exercises
on French Grammar; each Exercise being preceded by Grammatical
Questions.
3. Exercises in Translation No. 1, from French into
English, with general rules on Translation; and containing Notes, Hints,
and Cautions, founded on a comparison of the Grammar and Genius
of the two Languages.
4. Exercises in Translation No. 2, from English into
French, on the same plan as the preceding book.

FRENCH CLASSICS. By GUSTAVE MASSON, B.A., Univ. Gallic.,
Assistant Master in Harrow School.

1. Select Plays of Corneille: Cinna; Le Menteur.
[In the Press.]
2. Select Plays of Racine: Athalie; Andromaque.
3. Select Plays of Molière: Les Femmes Savantes;
Les Fourberies de Scapin.
4. Selections from the Correspondence of Madame de
Sévigné. (Intended more especially for girls' schools.)
5. Selections from modern French Authors.

IX. MISCELLANEOUS.

1. The Principles of Music. By the Rev. Sir F. A.
GORE OUSELEY, Bart., M.A., Mus. Doc., Professor of Music, Oxford.
2. A Handbook of Pictorial Art. With numerous
Illustrations and Practical Advice. By the Rev. R. ST. JOHN TYRWHITT,
M.A., formerly Student and Tutor of Christ Church.

IX. SERIES OF ENGLISH CLASSICS.

Designed to meet the wants of Students in English Literature : under the superintendence of the Rev. J. S. BREWER, M.A., of Queen's College, Oxford, and Professor of English Literature at King's College, London.

THERE are two dangers to which the student of English literature is exposed at the outset of his task ;—his reading is apt to be too narrow or too diffuse.

Out of the vast number of authors set before him in books professing to deal with this subject he knows not which to select ; he thinks he must read a little of all ; he soon abandons so hopeless an attempt ; he ends by contenting himself with second-hand information ; and professing to study English literature, he fails to master a single English author.

On the other hand, by confining his attention to one or two writers, or to one special period of English literature, the student narrows his view of it ; he fails to grasp the subject as a whole ; and in so doing misses one of the chief objects of his study.

How may these errors be avoided ? How may minute reading be combined with comprehensiveness of view ?

In the hope of furnishing an answer to these questions the Delegates of the Press, acting upon the advice and experience of Professor Brewer, have determined to issue a series of small volumes, which shall embrace, in a convenient form and at a low price, the general extent of English Literature, as represented in its masterpieces at successive epochs. It is thought that the student, by confining himself, in the first instance, to those authors who are most worthy of his attention, will be saved from the dangers of hasty and indiscriminate reading. By adopting the course thus marked out for him he will become familiar with the productions of the greatest minds in English Literature ; and should he never be able to pursue the subject beyond the limits here prescribed, he will have laid the foundation of accurate habits of thought and judgment, which cannot fail of being serviceable to him hereafter.

CLARENDON PRESS SERIES.

The authors and works selected are such as will best serve to illustrate English literature in its *historical aspect*—“the eye of history,” without which history cannot be understood, the literature of a nation is the clearest and most intelligible record of its life. Its thoughts, and its emotions, its graver and its less serious moods, its progress, or its degeneracy, are told by its best authors in their best words. A view of the subject will suggest the safest rules for the study of it.

With one exception all writers before the Reformation are excluded from the Series. However great may be the value of literature before that epoch, it is not completely national. It had no common organ of language; it addressed itself to special classes; it dealt mainly with special subjects. Even in the case of writers who flourished after the Reformation, who were popular in their day, and reflected the manners and sentiments of their age, the larger part by far must be excluded from our list. Common sense tells us that if young students, who have but a limited time at their disposal, read Chaucer, Spenser, Hooker, Shakspeare, Bacon, Milton, Dryden, Bunyan, Pope, Johnson, Burke, and Cowper. In other words, Chaucer is the exponent of the Middle Ages in England; Spenser of the Reformation and the Tudors; Hooker of the latter years of Elizabeth; Shakspeare and Bacon of the transition from Tudor to Stuart; Milton of Charles I and the Commonwealth; Dryden and Bunyan of the Restoration; Pope of Anne and the House of Hanover; Johnson, Burke, and Cowper of the reign of George III to the close of the last century.

The list could be easily enlarged; the names of Jeremy Bentham, Clarendon, Hobbes, Locke, Swift, Addison, Goldsmith, and others are omitted. But in so wide a field, the difficulty is to keep the series from becoming unwieldy, with-

out diminishing its comprehensiveness. Hereafter, should the plan prove to be useful, some of the masterpieces of the authors just mentioned may be added to the list.

The task of selection is not yet finished. For purposes of education, it would neither be possible, nor, if possible, desirable, to place in the hands of students the whole of the works of the authors we have chosen. We must set before them only the masterpieces of literature, and their studies must be directed, not only to the greatest minds, but to their choicest productions. These are to be read again and again, separately and in combination. Their purport, form, language, bearing on the times, must be minutely studied, till the student begins to recognise the full value of each work both in itself and in its relations to those that go before and those that follow it.

It is especially hoped that this Series may prove useful to Ladies' Schools and Middle Class Schools; in which English Literature must always be a leading subject of instruction.

A General Introduction to the Series.

By the Rev. PROFESSOR BREWER, M.A.

1. **Chaucer.** The Prologue to the Canterbury Tales; the Knight's Tale; the Nun's Priest's Tale.

Edited by R. MORRIS, Esq., Editor for the Early English Text Society, &c. &c. *[In the Press.]*

2. **Spenser.** Faery Queene, Book I., with the Poet's letter to Sir Walter Raleigh.

Edited by the Rev. G. W. KITCHIN, M.A., formerly Censor of Christ Church. *[In the Press.]*

3. **Hooker.** Ecclesiastical Polity, Book I.

Edited by the Rev. R. W. CHURCH, M.A., Rector of Whatley; formerly Fellow of Oriel College.

4. **Shakspeare.** Select Plays.

Edited by the Rev. W. G. CLARK, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Public Orator; and W. ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A., Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge.

5. **Bacon.** Essays ; Advancement of Learning.
Edited by W. ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A.
6. **Milton.** Allegro and Penseroso ; Comus ; Lycidas ;
Paradise Lost ; Samson Agonistes.
7. **Dryden.** Stanzas on the Death of Oliver Cromwell ;
Astraea Redux ; Annus Mirabilis ; Absalom and
Achitophel ; Religio Laici ; the Hind and Panther.
Edited by the Rev. PROFESSOR BREWER, M.A.
8. **Bunyan.** Grace Abounding ; The Pilgrim's Progress.
9. **Pope.** Essay on Man, with the Epistles and Satires.
Edited by the Rev. M. PATTISON, M.A., Rector of Lincoln
College, Oxford.
10. **Johnson.** Rasselas ; Lives of Pope and Dryden.
Edited by the Rev. J. FRASER, M.A., Rector of Upton-
Nervet ; formerly Fellow of Oriel College.
11. **Burke.** Thoughts on the Present Discontents ; the
two Speeches on America ; Reflections on the French
Revolution.
Edited by GOLDWIN SMITH, M.A., Fellow of University
College, Oxford ; formerly Regius Professor of Modern
History.
12. **Cowper.** The Task, and some of his minor Poems.
Edited by the Rev. T. L. CLAUGHTON, M.A., Vicar of
Kidderminster ; formerly Fellow of Trinity College,
Oxford, and Professor of Poetry.

Each volume will be (as nearly as possible) uniform in shape and size ; and at the same price. There will be a brief preface, biographical and literary, to each ; and each will have such short notes only as are absolutely needed for the elucidation of the text.

LIBRARY EDITIONS OF STANDARD WORKS,

PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS.

BURNET'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. A New Edition, carefully Revised, and the Records collated with the Originals. By the Rev. N. Pocock, M.A., late Michel Fellow of Queen's College. 7 vols. 8vo. cloth, 4*l.* 4*s.*

CLARENDON'S HISTORY OF THE REBELLION. With Notes by BISHOP WARBURTON. 7 vols. medium 8vo. cloth, 2*l.* 10*s.*

CLARENDON'S LIFE AND CONTINUATION OF HIS HISTORY, with the Suppressed Passages. 3 vols. 8vo. cloth, 16*s.* 6*d.*

BINGHAM'S ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, and other Works. 10 vols. 8vo. cloth, 5*l.* 5*s.*

FULLER'S CHURCH HISTORY OF BRITAIN. Edited by the Rev. J. S. BREWER. 6 vols. 8vo. cloth, 1*l.* 19*s.*

HALL'S (Bp.) WORKS. Edited by the Rev. PHILIP WYNTER, D.D. 10 vols. 8vo. cloth, 5*l.* 5*s.*

HOOKER'S WORKS; with his Life by WALTON, and additions, arranged by KEBLE. New Edition, 3 vols. 8vo. cloth, 3*l.* 6*d.*

HOOKER'S WORKS (without Keble's Notes). New Edition, 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, 1*l.* 1*s.*

HOOPER'S (Bp.) WORKS. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, 8*s.*

JACKSON'S (Dr. THOMAS) WORKS. 12 vols. 8vo. cloth, 3*l.* 6*s.*

JEWEL'S WORKS. By Dr. JELF. 8 vols. 8vo. cloth, 2*l.* 10*s.*

LESLIE'S THEOLOGICAL WORKS. 7 vols. 8vo. cloth, 2*l.*

BUTLER'S WORKS, with an Index to the Analogy. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, 1*l.* 1*s.*

OXFORD: Printed at the CLARENDON PRESS; and Published for the University by MACMILLAN & CO., LONDON.

CLARENDON PRESS

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

A TYPOGRAPHICAL GAZETTEER. Attempted by the Rev. HENRY COTTON, D.C.L., Archdeacon of Cashel, late Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian Library. Second Series. 8vo. cloth, 12s. 6d. Also, First Series, 8vo. cloth, 12s. 6d.

XENOPHONTIS OPUSCULA POLITICA EQUESTRIA ET VENATICA cum ARRIANI LIBELLO de VENATIONE. Ex Recensione et cum Annotationibus LUDOVICI DINDORFII. 8vo. cloth, 10s. 6d.

A HISTORY OF AGRICULTURE AND PRICES IN ENGLAND from 1259—1400. Compiled entirely from Original and Contemporaneous Records. By JAMES E. THOROLD ROGERS, M.A., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Oxford; Tooke Professor of Economic Science and Statistics, King's College, London. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, 2l. 2s.

BRITTON. The French Text carefully revised, with an English Translation, Introduction, and Notes. By FRANCIS MORGAN NICHOLS, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law, formerly Fellow of Wadham College. 2 vols. large 8vo. 36s.

TWO OF THE SAXON CHRONICLES PARALLEL: with Supplementary Extracts from the others. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and a Glossarial Index, by JOHN EARLE, M.A., sometime Fellow and Tutor of Oriel College, and Professor of Anglo-Saxon, Rector of Swanswick. 8vo. cloth, 16s.

A CATALOGUE OF THE ORIGINAL WORKS OF JOHN WYCLIF. By WALTER WADDINGTON SHIRLEY, D.D., late Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Canon of Christ Church. 8vo. cloth, 3s. 6d.

S. EPHRÆMI SYRI, RABULÆ EPISCOPI EDESSENI, BALÆI ALIORUMQUE OPERA SELECTA. E Códicibus Syriacis Manuscriptis in Museo Britannico et Bibliotheca Bodleiana asservatis primus edidit J. JOSEPHUS OVERBECK, S. Theologiæ et Philosophiæ Doctor, Collegii Militaris Regii Superioris Professor. 8vo. cloth, 21s.

OXFORD: Printed at the CLARENDON PRESS; and Published for the University by MACMILLAN & CO., LONDON.

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

This book is due on the last **DATE** stamped below.

MAR 7 1978

MAR 23 1978 REC'D

50m-12,'70(P1251#8)2873-3A,1



